

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Joseph Gedra, pastor, St. Paul's Church, Damascus, Md., offered the following prayer:

We pray Thee, O Heavenly Father, in behalf of many of Thy faithful people, living in our own and in other free lands, who are sadly commemorating the independence of their small nation, Lithuania, which by Thy grace, it regained 43 years ago, only to lose it later to an aggressive and atheistic neighbor. Together with them, we humbly and reverently beseech Thee to be mindful of the plight of those who are at this moment bravely enduring the hardships of enslavement at the hands of Thy enemies; and we implore Thee to keep alive in their hearts the hope that Thou wilt not abandon them who remain loyal to Thee.

Assure them, O Lord, that their struggle to glorify and worship Thee in private and in public; to live decently according to Thy laws and principles; to associate freely and honorably and peaceably with other nations, will not be in vain.

And we pray Thee also, inspire us with Thy heavenly wisdom and courage to assist Lithuania, her Baltic neighbors and other persecuted peoples, to realize their national aspirations and to take their rightful place in the society of free and godly nations, so that it may not be said of us, who are so richly blessed by Thee, that the children of darkness are wiser than the children of light. Through Jesus Christ Thy beloved Son and our Divine Mediator with Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution, as follows:

S. RES. 89

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Honorable W. F. Norrell, late a Representative from the State of Arkansas.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 681. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteor-

ology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences.

S. 683. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS OF THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 46, 87th Congress, the Chair appoints as additional members of the Select Committee To Conduct Studies and Investigations of the Problems of Small Business the following Members of the House:

Mr. McCulloch, Ohio; Mr. Moore, West Virginia; Mr. Avery, Kansas; Mr. Smith, California; Mr. Robison, New York; and Mr. Derwinski, Illinois.

U.S. DELEGATION OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Ottawa, Canada, from February 22 to February 26, 1961, the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. Gallagher, New Jersey, chairman; Mrs. Kelly, New York; Mr. Yates, Illinois; Mr. Ikard, Texas; Mr. Dulski, New York; Mr. Philbin, Massachusetts; Mr. Stratton, New York; Mr. Curtis, Massachusetts; Mr. Broomfield, Michigan; Mr. Cunningham, Nebraska; Mr. Harvey, Michigan; and Mr. Tupper, Maine.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, February 22, 1961, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the Chair designates the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEERMANN] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the reading of the Journal on February 22, 1961.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Roosevelt subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit this afternoon during the special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

IDEOLOGICAL FALLACIES OF COMMUNISM

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a telegram sent to me as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities by Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of the Christian Herald magazine. Dr. Poling appeared before the committee in 1957 as one of three prominent clergymen of the Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant faiths, respectively, who took part in a consultation on the subject "Ideological Fallacies of Communism." Along with Rabbi A. Andhill Fineberg and Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, Dr. Poling proved himself a formidable adversary of the Communist conspiracy in a trenchant exposé of its philosophy of universal regimentation and enslavement of the individual and complete denial of God. Dr. Poling has never ceased in his efforts toward alerting our citizenry to the tactics of the Communist forces and to the urgency for meeting them head on.

Dr. Poling's telegram is as follows:

A petition to the House of Representatives of the 87th Congress to eliminate the Committee on Un-American Activities carries some 400 signatures. Among these are 62 Protestant clergymen and 18 Jewish rabbis. I dissent. Also, I find no Roman Catholic bishops or priests included among these 400. And in sharp contrast with the petition was the speech of Frederick H. Boland, President of the United Nations General Assembly, received with enthusiasm by more than 1,200 Roman Catholic high school teachers, calling upon religious educators to take the "offensive against atheistic communism." President Boland's address was carried by the same press that printed the paid advertisement of the 400. I believe that these 400 do not represent but that they do misrepresent the vast majority of their fellow Protestants and Jews, indeed the vast majority of their fellow Americans. Few, if any, of these 400 have ever signed petitions against subversion or have ever identified themselves against un-American activities. Few, if any, of these 400 have ever engaged in an unequivocal campaign against atheistic communism. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, warns the Nation that communism was never more alert and never more dangerous to American freedom than right now. Whatever the mistakes of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, this committee has never made

the fatal mistake of being soft to communism. To discontinue or discredit it now would be a disservice to America and to the free world. The committee should be continued and constructively strengthened.

DANIEL A. POLING,
Editor, *Christian Herald Magazine*.

A SENSIBLE PROGRAM FOR AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the major issues facing this Congress has been the need to provide assistance for education. We passed a bill on this subject last year, and it is my understanding that the President is sending up a message on Monday with somewhat similar recommendations for this year. This assistance is important and certainly desperately needed. Yet in our effort to improve our elementary and secondary education let us not forget the importance of higher education as well, and the need to recognize our obligation to provide assistance to it, too.

One of the doubts raised by those opposing aid to education has been the charge that such assistance might lead to Federal control. I do not favor Federal control of education, and I would oppose legislation which I felt might lead to that kind of situation. When it comes to higher education there is, in fact, a very simple remedy which completely avoids any possibility of Federal control. This is to supply assistance through the parents or guardians who have made this education possible, namely by tax relief for the funds expended on this highly useful purpose.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 4171, to extend to the parents of college students a special tax credit for funds spent toward their higher education. Under the terms of my bill parents or guardians would be allowed to claim as a credit on their Federal income tax 30 percent of the amount paid out during the year to institutions of higher education as tuition or fees for the education of any person at a level above the 12th grade.

In introducing this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I am carrying out a pledge I made during my recent campaign. At that time I considered introducing legislation to permit taxpayers to deduct the total of educational payments from their taxable income. On closer examination, however, it became clear that such a program would be of much greater benefit to those in the higher tax brackets for whom a deduction in taxable income would mean a proportionately greater reduction in the tax to be paid. By authorizing a tax credit of 30 percent in place of a deduction, however, the advantage accrues instead to those in the lower income brackets who will actually need this kind of assistance most anyway.

Mr. Speaker, education is one of our most important problems today. We

need to encourage higher education. We need to make higher education available to those who might not otherwise secure it because of their financial situation, and we need in particular to encourage those institutions which continue to operate as private centers of American higher education. The bill I have introduced, H.R. 4171, would not only give them a real assist from the Federal Government by providing this help indirectly through our tax laws, but would also insure that there would be no possible question as to Federal intervention or control of education itself.

PROBLEM OF STEAMSHIP CONFERENCES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this week for appropriate reference the bill, H.R. 4299, to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to provide for the operation of steamship conferences.

This bill represents an attempt to meet most of the major complaints made by interested witnesses during the course of the 2-year study of the problem of steamship conferences by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I think this bill, in its present form, will provide the mechanism needed to maintain stability in the waterborne foreign commerce of the United States and thereby protect the legitimate interests of both shipper and carrier. By bringing together in legislative form the principal points and issues raised in the record of our extensive hearings, I believe this bill provides a reasonable basis from which we may hope to produce much needed corrective legislation in this session of Congress.

Full scale hearings held by the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, as well as the Merchant Marine Committee hearings, strongly indicated that additional regulatory power should be given to the Federal Maritime Board. We have made no attempt to cover this aspect of the problem in the current bill, but in all probability it will come up for active consideration in the course of hearings on this bill. Moreover, it is believed that much benefit can be gained by considering the matter of regulatory powers in the light of the Judiciary subcommittee's hearings and findings. Much valuable material has been developed by that subcommittee in its extensive investigations.

The Subcommittee on Steamship Conferences has scheduled hearings to begin on this bill on March 7.

DOPE—RED CHINA'S SECRET WEAPON

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the very dangerous elements in the Chinese cold war is the spreading of the use of narcotics. In the old days, imperial China became convinced that poppy cultivation was destructive to the nation, and made it illegal. It appears that the Communist Chinese are encouraging not only the growing of poppies on a large scale, but the exportation of dope in all forms. In various ways and sometimes actually by force, narcotics are forced upon a victim until he becomes an addict and must have the drug.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Record, together with these remarks, an article which is a reprint from *Christian Economics* of December 13, 1960. I hope that those who are interested in these matters will be made more knowledgeable of this very serious problem by reading the article, which is as follows:

DOPE—RED CHINA'S SECRET WEAPON

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

Communist China, the world's biggest dope peddler today, has launched a new worldwide drive for admission into the United Nations.

She needs this new badge of prestige badly if she is to protect and expand her \$1-billion-a-year traffic in narcotics.

For the first time in human history, the systematic production and distribution of narcotic drugs has become an organized government monopoly in Red China. In 10 years, Mao Tse-tung has built up a virtual world monopoly in opium, heroin, and morphine.

Membership in the U.N. would give the Chinese Communists lawful and open access, through pro forma trade missions, to every major city in the United States of America, Latin America, and Western Europe. At present, all these dope outlets are maintained through illicit underground connections, at great cost to the narcotics trust in Peking.

Details of the flourishing Chinese drug traffic came to light in a recent report from the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

Harry J. Anslinger, Chief of the Narcotics Bureau, U.S. Treasury Department, was the U.S. delegate to the special U.N. conference on the rapidly expanding narcotics trade.

Anslinger named Fang Jung Ho as China's chief of special trade. He is the cabinet officer in charge of dope operations the world around.

"Spreading narcotic addiction and obtaining funds for political purposes through the sale of heroin and opium is not just the policy of one man in the Communist regime. It is the policy of the entire Communist regime in mainland China," Anslinger told the U.N. Commission. "There is a close relation with the People's Bank of China, both of which have local branches throughout the country, with special counters to handle loans, credits, and mortgages for opium. The transportation of opium shipments is guarded by the armed forces."

Incoming shipments of raw opium from the countryside are analyzed and graded by the Shanghai hygienic department, just as eggs are candied and graded in New York or Chicago before shipment.

When an international narcotics contract is signed, through the Red China tobacco monopoly, the papers are turned over to the

regional army commander. The army arranges the landing at the specified foreign port.

Narcotics experts attached to the Commission estimate that more than 5 million acres of land in starving China are now devoted exclusively to intensive cultivation of narcotic poppies.

Everyone connected with the Communist dope traffic is charged with the daily responsibility and duty of recruiting new addicts to chase the dragon, as the habit is described throughout the Orient.

Anslinger documented for the U.N. Commission the case of a young Japanese seaman, Saito, who signed on one of the ships in the Chinese dope fleet from Yokohama.

During his first voyage Saito, who was not an addict, was tied hand and foot and forcibly given heroin injections until he manifested a craving for the drug. He becomes a confirmed addict.

Youngsters thus forced to chase the dragon become ready servants of the Chinese dope mobsters, eager for any criminal assignment or violence which will assure their daily narcotic requirements. By this technique, Communist China has built up a ready army of fiendish criminals in all the principal port cities of the world.

Despite intensified police work throughout the United States, new addicts are cultivated daily in every major city, chiefly because Communist sources send in a constant dope supply for their pushers.

"All the documents examined by the United Nations coming from all governments in that area point to the fact that Communist China is the major source of supply of narcotics for the entire world," Anslinger reported.

New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C., Illinois, and all of California were cited by Anslinger as the principal retail dope markets in the United States.

"In California, after months of intensive investigation, which took a lot of money and very dangerous undercover work, we came up with a group of Chinese who had been smuggling from Communist China. They had a direct connection with Hong Kong. A fellow in Hong Kong by the name of Judah Isaac Ezra, whom we had sent to the penitentiary years ago, had the connections inside China, and was taking care of most of the traffic into the United States.

"For several years I have presented documented facts which establish that narcotic trafficking from the Chinese mainland is an insidious, calculated scheme of the Chinese Communist regime to obtain operating funds and, at the same time, spread the debauchery of narcotic addiction among the free nations," Anslinger's report to the U.N. continued.

"In most instances the heroin was brought into the country concealed on the persons of seamen. Ornately carved camphorwood chests with specially built compartments were also used for the smuggling operations."

Opium poppies are bid in by the Bank of China at \$72 per pound, American, and refined heroin at \$500 per pound.

"In Kwangtung Province the opium poppy planting is about three times what it was in 1951. The yield must be sold to the Communist cooperatives."

In one recent year Los Angeles accounted for 7,000 narcotics arrests, out of a total of 24,000 for the entire United States.

New York City now has increased its police narcotics squad to 200 men.

"The teenage problem is still with us," Anslinger told the House Appropriations Committee, "but that is spotty. It certainly is not general. You will not find it, say, through the South, or even in Pittsburgh, and there are very few teenage cases in Philadelphia. The real teenage problem is in New York, Chicago, Detroit, and Los Angeles. In relation to schools, the only

problem we have is in New York City. The city and State of New York jointly set up a special hospital for adolescent drug addicts. They have had a daily population, roughly, between 60 and 100 patients."

The narcotics traffic serves international communism in two very practical ways. It provides tremendous dollar and sterling exchange pools all around the world; secondly, the traffic is a fiendish weapon of sabotage against the free world, for every new addict impairs and undermines in some degree the total productive power of the victim nation.

Should the United Nations vote to admit the world's foremost dope mobster?

COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a measure already sponsored by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH and more than 30 Members of the other body, and by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, and 5 other colleagues in this body, which is known as the cold war GI bill.

This legislation would provide educational and vocational benefits for more than 4 million GI's who have served our country in the post-Korean war period.

The benefits provided in this bill are not so great as those provided in the World War II and Korean war GI bills, but they do provide genuine incentives to military service and to make provision for the saving of the benefits until the time for retirement from the service, on completion of 20 years in uniform.

In the final analysis, there is no question about who is the chief beneficiary of legislation of this kind. It was demonstrated conclusively in both the World War II and Korean war programs. That beneficiary is Uncle Sam himself—the Nation at large—which is much stronger and better equipped today by reason of these highly successful programs.

I hope and trust the Congress will soon act to place this much needed and well proved program in operation for the veterans of today.

SMALL PRODUCERS BILL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, has today announced that hearings will begin on March 9, before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining on the measure known to this body as the small lead and zinc producers bill.

This measure, which passed both Houses of Congress in 1960 only to be vetoed, has been reintroduced in the 87th Congress by the Honorable WALTER BARING, of Nevada; the Honorable GRACIE

PFOST, of Idaho; the Honorable WALTER McVEY, of Kansas; the Honorable JOSEPH MONTOYA, of New Mexico; the Honorable VERNON W. THOMSON, of Wisconsin; and by myself.

Conditions in the lead and zinc mining area of the country are much more serious today than they were in 1960, when this body recognized the need for this legislation after careful consideration on the floor.

I trust the hearings beginning on March 9 may be speedily concluded and the Members of Congress will soon have an opportunity to vote once again on this measure of vital importance to our depressed lead and zinc mining districts.

THE LATE MR. PAUL WOOTON

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that other Members of this body were as greatly shocked and saddened as I this morning to learn of the sudden tragic passing of one of America's greatest American newspapermen, Mr. Paul Wooton. He was for many years head of the New Orleans Times-Picayune Bureau in Washington, and was known as the dean of the Washington press corps. I am certain no newspaperman in America was better loved than he.

It was my privilege to have known Mr. Wooton rather intimately during the 14 years I have been in Washington, and I can say with complete sincerity that he was one of the finest men I have ever known. Indeed, he had received virtually every honor that could come to a man of his profession, and was perhaps Washington's most honored and most distinguished newsman.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the following account of Mr. Wooton's passing which appears in today's Washington Star, which outlines briefly some of Mr. Wooton's accomplishments and which gives a brief account of his career:

PAUL WOOTON DIES AT 79; DEAN OF PRESS CORPS

Paul Wooton, 79, Washington correspondent of the New Orleans Times-Picayune since 1914 and known as "dean of the Washington press corps," died yesterday in a District taxicab.

Mr. Wooton, who was stricken after covering a meeting of the National Labor Relations Board, was taken by the cab driver to Doctors Hospital where he was pronounced dead. He lived at 3016 Tilden Street NW.

The veteran reporter had headed practically all the important press organizations in Washington and was an intimate friend of six Presidents during his long career. President Kennedy yesterday said he was "extremely saddened" to learn of the death of Mr. Wooton. He described Mr. Wooton as "a distinguished journalist and a man who has contributed much to his profession and his country."

KIND TO MARGARET

Mr. Wooton was particularly close to former President Truman, who as a Senator

lived in the same apartment building with the newsmen in the 1930s. "And he was as kind to Margaret as anybody can be," the former President once said of Mr. Wooton's friendship to his daughter, adding, "and when anybody is kind to Margaret, I never forget it."

Mr. Wooton, recognized as an authority on politics, business, and trade, had served as president of the White House Correspondents Association, the Overseas Writers, the National Press Club, Business Papers Correspondents and the National Conference of Business Editors. He also was a member of the Sigma Delta Chi journalism fraternity.

Mr. Wooton also had been president of the Gridiron Club, the Louisiana State Society, and the Washington Society of Engineers, and a member of the Cosmos Club, the Metropolitan Club, and the Chevy Chase Club.

ARRANGING DINNER

At the time of his death he was making arrangements for the annual White House correspondents' dinner for the President on February 25 in the Sheraton-Park.

Mr. Wooton, as an official of the various press groups, had acted as chief press host to dignitaries visiting this country. They included Queen Elizabeth II, Queen Juliana of the Netherlands, and former Prime Minister Churchill.

Queen Elizabeth was so impressed with Mr. Wooton's handling of her meeting with the press here in 1951 as a princess that she gave him the title of Officer of the Order of the British Empire. He also had been made a member of the Order of St. Olav by King Haakon of Norway in recognition of articles he wrote about the Norwegian resistance during World War II.

His influence with Presidents was famous. He persuaded President Coolidge to start the annual Christmas tree ceremony at the White House. He also played a role in President Eisenhower's becoming a Presbyterian. Mr. Wooton held the font when Mr. Eisenhower was baptized at the National Presbyterian Church, of which the reporter was an elder.

On his 75th birthday, 500 persons crowded the auditorium of the Press Club to participate in the celebration. Among those present were Vice President Nixon, Justice William O. Douglas, of the Supreme Court, and Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey.

WITH MCGRAW-HILL

Besides his Washington post with the New Orleans paper, Mr. Wooton worked nearly 40 years in building up the Washington bureau of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. He also greatly increased the prestige of the business reporters, who for a long time did not share the same esteem as political journalists in Washington.

Mr. Wooton also was a regular contributor to Dun's Review and the Business Press News Bureau. He was on the editorial board of Chilton Publications.

A native of Indiana, Mr. Wooton began his career as cub reporter in Mexico for the Mexican Herald. He joined the Times-Picayune in 1911. His wife, the former Jewell Monday, died here in 1946.

He leaves three sisters, Miss Margaret Wooton, of Muskegon, Mich.; Mrs. Walter B. Roberts, of Rock Hill, S.C., and Mrs. Florence Nicholas, of 1330 Irving Street NW.

In addition to the honors mentioned in this article, Mr. Wooton served, also, as president of the Mississippi State Society.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Paul Wooton was literally one who "walked with kings" but never lost the common touch. The newspaper world mourns the passing of a giant of its profession, and all of us here have lost a great friend.

The following editorial, which appears also in today's Washington Star, speaks the sentiments of all of us, I am sure, who had the pleasure and privilege of knowing Mr. Wooton during his lifetime:

PAUL WOOTON

Paul Wooton's sudden death yesterday at the age of 79 is in the nature of a closely personal loss to literally scores of newspapermen in Washington. In his long career here, dating from the Wilson administration back in the teens, he did many things for them collectively and individually. He had served as president of most of their organizations. His office had become the busy center of the detailed arrangements for many of their organizational enterprises. He was the natural choice when it came to the selection of someone to represent them in the semi-official or purely social gatherings of the press—including its various components.

Yet his self-imposed and extracurricular activities for his own brethren, and in other unrelated fields, never overshadowed his own professional standing as a competent Washington correspondent of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, and the dean of business publication representatives in the Capital. He did many useful things. Yet he will be remembered more by those who knew him for what he was than for the many things he did. He was an unusual gentleman in this thoughtful kindness to others, in his unselfish interest in those who needed help, in his adoption of a code of living which came as near to being the practical application of the Golden Rule as mortal man can achieve. The sudden termination of Paul Wooton's various activities will leave a void. But it is Paul Wooton himself who will be missed.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am pleased to yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to place a little verbal flower upon the bier of Paul Wooton. I, along with his thousands of other friends, was shocked to learn of his sudden passing. Paul Wooton was one of the most highly respected and greatly beloved members of the large fraternity of newspaper men in this Capital City of the world.

He came to Washington in 1940 as a representative of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, one of the most outstanding newspapers in this country. In later years he was joined by another beloved character, Edgar Poe, who has worked in close and harmonious cooperation with Paul Wooton for the past 20 years. They have worked as a team and rendered splendid service to this great newspaper. Paul also served some of the leading trade publications of the Nation. For years he was the Washington representative of the McGraw-Hill Publications and for the past several years he has served in a similar capacity the Chilton Publications. Several years ago his devotion to duty, his outstanding qualities, and above all, his high character, were recognized by his fellow newspaper men when he was elected to the presidency of the National Press Club. Here, as elsewhere, he did a splendid job in that role.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, to know him was to love him. I join with his many friends in extending to his bereaved family my sincerest regret at his passing. However, they, as well as the rest of us, can find comfort in the knowledge that he

lived a useful life and died as he would have wished—in harness.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the remarks which the gentleman has made on the life of a truly great correspondent, Paul Wooton—every inch a gentleman; a man whose word was his bond; whose integrity was never questioned; whose ability was transcendent in the field that he represented.

He served as a correspondent to the press with an efficiency and an accuracy seldom achieved by the great writers and, at the same time, maintained in the high offices in the Congress and in the executive branch of Government a host of friends that share with us today his tragic passing.

Mr. Speaker, almost the first correspondent I met when I came to this Congress almost 25 years ago was Paul Wooton, dean of the White House correspondents. Mr. Wooton had been born in Clinton County, Ind., the son of a circuit-riding Methodist minister. His career as telegrapher, reporter, and sometime schoolteacher took him to Mexico for several years; and then he joined the Times-Picayune Publishing Co. in New Orleans in 1911. He remained with the Times-Picayune until the very day of his death.

Because of his representation of this great southern newspaper I had occasion to meet with Mr. Paul Wooton very often. Typical of him was his attitude of fairness in approaching even the most controversial matter. He had the ability to sit down and talk to those with whom he might strongly disagree on some phase of a national program or on some national program. But, regardless of this, Paul Wooton never failed in his writings to fairly present the views of those he contacted, with accuracy and with a wealth of experience.

For many years I lived in Washington in an apartment immediately across the street from the home of Mr. and Mrs. Wooton at 3016 Tilden Street NW. Mrs. Wooton died in 1946. Often it was my pleasure to visit with him after he returned from a long and arduous day's work. He had the ability to throw off the travail of the day and the problems of the hour and enter wholeheartedly into the levity of our meetings. Only about 2 weeks ago, at his request, I spoke to a group of editors from throughout the United States. Although he had reached the age of 79, Mr. Paul Wooton showed on that occasion a brilliance of intellect and a physical stamina that had carried him through the activities of this convention of editors until the very close of the session.

I do not know that we in Louisiana can claim this distinguished correspondent who has now gone on to his reward. I, for one, however would like to do so. His long years of service with the Times-Picayune in New Orleans gives me some semblance of right in this direction but, in a larger sense, Paul Wooton as a correspondent and as a representative of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., belongs to

the entire Nation. His works on industrial problems and on financial conditions were outstanding and received the praise and approval of the millions who read his forceful articles.

I have no misgivings regarding the future of the press of our Nation as long as men with the caliber, abilities, and integrity of Paul Wooton remain in positions of prominence. He has left to the Capital press and to the Nation a rich heritage of honor, integrity, and fair dealing which those of us who follow may well emulate.

Mr. Wooton is survived by three sisters, Florence Nicholas, 1330 Irving Street NW.; Georgiana Roberts, of Rock Hill, S.C.; and Margaret Wooton, of Muskegon, Mich. To all of them, in this dark hour, goes our deep and abiding sympathy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman.

LITHUANIA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time this year, as we have for many years in this House, in order to pay tribute to a freedom-loving nation, now a captive country of the Soviets. This ceremony is in commemoration and in tribute of the independence of Lithuania. February 16 is the day set aside for this ceremony, but because of the passing of our beloved late colleague Mr. Norrell, of Arkansas, we were set over until today.

Further, Mr. Speaker, on this day, the world day of prayer, it is fitting and proper that I begin my tribute to Lithuania with a prayer, and to speak for the American citizens in whose veins flows the proud blood of Lithuanian ancestors, a great religious, Christian organization for centuries.

On this world day of prayer I would offer the following supplication:

Eternal God, Maker and Master of the universe, look kindly upon Your children of all races and nations. Forgive us our selfishness and anger and teach us to live at peace with one another. Forgive us our foolish pride in the little knowledge we have gained in Your vast universe, and in the fumbling attempts we are making to use the power, and to explore the space, that are Your gift. Grant us the grace to be kind, a good sense to be humble, a practical wisdom to be at one with our fellow men as we prepare for earth's greatest adventure, the voyaging to other realms in space.

Help each one of us to see his duty and to do it, and to walk a straight path of virtue in daily labor and business dealings, in relations with family and friends, in all that we may do to affect neighborhood and national and international conditions. Help us in our endeavor to attain honesty, and a clear view of ourselves in our relationships with the world around us, so that each one of us may strive effectively toward making the world a better place for all of us to live in.

Mr. Speaker, today when we think of wars, we all have in mind the death and destruction they bring in their train, and we rightly shudder at the mere thought of another war. But in the past there has been no easy way to break the chain which held down helpless nations under tyrannical regimes except through wars and revolutions. The war of 1914-18 was such a war: when it was over many oppressed nationalities regained their freedom and attained national independence. Lithuania, whose independence day is being celebrated today, is one of the countries which attained its independence in the course of that war.

The Lithuanians are justly proud of their long and glorious history, as they are of their ceaseless struggle against their oppressors for freedom. Late in middle ages and early in modern times theirs was a powerful kingdom, one of the largest in Eastern Europe. For centuries they not only succeeded in repelling some of the incursions of ferocious barbarian invaders coming from the east into northeastern Europe, but they were also gallant champions of Christianity and formed its advance guard in that part of Europe. Then late in the 16th century they united with the Poles and formed a dual monarchy. This voluntary union lasted 200 years. In late 18th century when Poland was partitioned and most of it fell to Russia, Lithuania was incorporated into the Russian Empire.

That marked the loss of freedom for the Lithuanian people, but the loss of national independence did not mean the loss of the Lithuanian spirit of freedom. Throughout their trying years, for more than a century, under czarist domination the Lithuanians learned that individual or group well-being could not be fully achieved or enjoyed without national political independence. They learned that in order to enjoy the fruits of their labor, they must have freedom in their homeland, be masters of their own destiny. Consequently, they united and worked ceaselessly for the realization of their most cherished dream, for the independence of Lithuania. None of the repressive measures of the Russian Government, none of its harsh brutality, nor its proscription of the Lithuanian language and culture, none of these could prevent the patriotic and freedom-loving Lithuanians from striving for the realization of their national goal. They fought for it openly as well as clandestinely. They staged open rebellion against their oppressors more than once, but they had to await until World War I for the actual achievement of their national independence. Finally on February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their independence.

Thereafter for more than two decades the Lithuanians lived in freedom and enjoyed it to the full. Then early in the Second World War came the rude shock from the sudden unleashing of evil international forces. Hemmed in between two totalitarian dictatorships, and without the effective aid of her friends in the West, little Lithuania could not hope to ward off the dangers to her very existence from either tyrannies. Actually commu-

nism proved to be the more deadly; early in 1940 the country was overrun by the Red army, and in July it was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Thus ended two decades of glad tidings for Lithuanians and thus vanished the independent and sovereign state of Lithuania.

Since those fateful days unfortunate Lithuanians have been living under the worst tyrannies known in modern history. For a short time during the last war they suffered under the Nazis. Toward the end of that war, when the Nazis were evicted, their place was taken by the equally cruel and heartless minions of the Kremlin. The Communist regime has been there ever since with all its attendant evils, its commissars and spy rings, its informers and executioners, and it has succeeded in changing the life in Lithuania to one of regimented horrors. They owe their success in this respect to their deadly efficiency, but fortunately for the Lithuanians, and also for their friends and sympathizers, these cruel taskmasters have not been able to subdue and suppress the native spirit of freedom and independence of the Lithuanian people. That is the one bright aspect of their miserable and unenviable existence.

Unfortunately, also, there is the fact that while these champions of freedom in that borderland of totalitarian darkness and democratic light have been suffering, during all these years the free world has not been able to help them in any effective way. Thus far no matter how hard the leaders of the West have tried to better the lot of these unfortunate people, it has not been possible to work out a way whereby Lithuanians could regain some of their lost freedom and enjoy some of the fruits of their hard labor in their beloved homeland. However, we pray and hope on this 43d anniversary celebration of their independence day that soon the people of Lithuania will have freedom to enjoy life in their historic homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the world arena of great power politics the fate of small nations is usually decided by forces over which they have no control. They are often the victims of events originating beyond their geographic boundaries, in the chancelleries of certain great powers. This is particularly true today, but it was hardly less so in recent past. The tragedy of the Lithuanian people is a case in point.

These sturdy and stouthearted people had lived in freedom for centuries and had their glory, but since the early 16th century their country had united with Poland and formed a dual monarchy. Late in the 18th century when Russia appropriated most of Poland, Lithuania, too, was absorbed. Thus, freedom had vanished for the Lithuanian people for some 100 years before they regained it in 1918.

During the First World War when czarist Russia was overthrown, the Lithuanians felt free, and proclaimed their independence on February 16, 43 years ago. At that time they rejoiced over

their success, as did all their friends everywhere, and it was hoped that in time they would be enabled to safeguard their richly deserved freedom. This they did for two decades. During those anxious interwar years they worked hard to make Lithuania a happy place for its people. They were justly proud of their splendid record of performance. Then at the approach of the Second World War all their achievements, even their independence, seemed to be in jeopardy. They were one of the first victims of that war. As the Red army moved into the Baltic countries as a scourge and terror, independent Lithuania vanished, its inhabitants became prisoners behind the extending net of the Red army, and the country became part of the Soviet Union.

The conclusion of the war in 1945 did not bring about any change in Lithuania. The Communist hold over the country was tightened, and its helpless inhabitants were imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. Today the country is practically closed to the outside world. No Lithuanian is allowed to leave it, and no one except a very few with special guides and permits are allowed to enter it. We have some disheartening news about Lithuanians: thousands of them were uprooted from their homes and people from Asiatic areas were brought in to take their place. All Lithuanians living on the seashore were forced to move to the interior, and they have been forced to work on collective farms. They have lost their personal possessions, and all are in the employ of the state. It is unthinkable that they should have freedom under such a system: freedom of speech, of assembly, and of movement is forbidden. The activities of individuals and groups are closely watched, as everyone lives in constant fear of arrest and imprisonment. Under such conditions it is hardly expected that these people are able to rebel against their ruthless oppressors. At the same time there is no question that they are keeping up their love for freedom and are striving for its attainment. On the 43d anniversary of their independence day though we cannot be of real positive assistance to them, we fervently pray that some day and soon they attain their goal, their freedom, and independence in their homeland.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Lithuanian nation which day will always stand out as one of the memorable events in the long battle for freedom by the Lithuanian people.

No nation over the centuries can boast of a more valiant struggle to win self-government and maintain national freedom than Lithuania. The powerful Russian Government under the czar, for long years at different intervals of time, imposed its tyrannical rule upon this nation. During five different periods of its long history, the Lithuanian people rose in open rebellion against terrific odds in opposition to Russian domina-

tion of its country by the tyrannical czars. In each rebellion, the Lithuanian people fought against terrific odds in numbers, armament, and power, but never at any time gave up their battle for freedom and independence.

During recent years, the Communist tyranny has practically isolated the Lithuanian people. The Iron Curtain has been lowered further on this nation than the average satellite nation by the Communists. The Lithuanian people have suffered by reason of the rigid regulations, prison camps, and other crimes inflicted on helpless people in order to subjugate them under Soviet enslavement. The Lithuanian people will continue their struggle for independence and freedom until self-government is restored to these valiant and heroic people. The Communist tyranny is today exerting every effort to discredit and defeat the purposes of the United Nations organization. The demonstration which took place in the United Nations yesterday when U.S. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson was speaking on freedom for all nations in Africa to avoid communistic colonialism, was another evidence that the Communist leaders have not given up their fight for world domination.

I know the people of Lithuania, and all satellite nations now under the Communist heel, will support every effort being made by our Government as the leader of the free world, to continue the fight against Communist expansion and to aid all enslaved nations in their battle to regain freedom. World history reveals that no tyrant or group of tyrants through the force of prison camps, massacres, tortures, and so forth, can permanently enslave human beings. The spirit for human freedom burns in the hearts of all mankind and cannot be destroyed by tyrants, regardless of their force and power. Someday the enslaved nations will gain self-government and freedom and Lithuania will continue its valiant fight for freedom until victory is won.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]. I might say that these words said here today by the Members of this great forum of liberty will go out through the Voice of America, will go out through the facilities of Radio Free Europe, behind the Iron Curtain, to all of these captive nations, including Lithuania, where there are millions, as the gentleman from Indiana well knows, waiting to be reassured and to hear these voices spoken here by the Representatives of the people of this great country, that they are not forgotten here and will not be forgotten here. That is why I am so pleased that my colleagues are saying these words.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for reserving this time and handling this hour. He has handled this hour for many years.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of the First World War all submerged and suppressed

national groups in Europe regained their independence. Among these were the Lithuanian people who, having suffered under Russian autocracy for more than 100 years, proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918.

Lithuanians have a distinct place in the turbulent history of northern Europe. They have the most numerous of the three Baltic national groups—about 3 million in all—and they have always been stout defenders of liberty. During their subjection to Russian regime, they managed to keep their love of liberty and their patriotic sentiments alive. Their sturdy and unyielding spirit, fortified by their firm belief in Christian principles, served them well. Throughout their eventful history they have clung to Christianity with the same fervor and tenacity as they have to their historic homeland. There they waited for the opportune moment to assert their freedom, and that moment came soon after the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia, during the First World War. On February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their independence and established the Lithuanian Republic.

The next two decades were the happiest years in the modern history of the Lithuanian people. Under their chosen form of democratic government, they made remarkable strides in many walks of life, and their little country became a model democracy in that part of the world. There they were contented and happy in perfect freedom. But the rise of aggressive dictatorships in Germany and Russia and the strengthening of implacable communism in Russia caused serious apprehensions.

Then with the outbreak of the last war, the worst apprehensions of the Lithuanian people were confirmed. The presence of greedy Soviet forces on Lithuania's borders almost terrorized its inhabitants. Early in 1940 the country was invaded and occupied by the Red army, and then it was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Thus vanished the Lithuanian Republic and also the freedom of its people.

During the war the country changed its master, for about 2 years it was held and occupied by the Nazis, but of course, that was no better as far as the people were concerned, they suffered much under Nazi occupation. In 1944 victorious Communists returned and since then they have been there. They have robbed the Lithuanians of all their worldly possessions, and they have also deprived them of all forms of freedom. And they are forbidden to leave the country. Under these depressing, almost disheartening conditions, unhappy Lithuanians carry on, and cling to the conviction that in the end their righteous cause will triumph, they will regain their freedom and live in peace in their beloved homeland.

On the 43d anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, the free world should meditate upon the hardships of the Lithuanian people and that of her sister nations. The free nations should consider what we can do to encourage them as to what can be done to bring about their eventual lib-

eration. I wish them power and fortitude in their struggle against Communist tyranny.

The spirit of freedom is rooted deeply in the minds and hearts of the Lithuanian people. No communistic country will ever gag their hopes and prayers for freedom. The Lithuanians stand firmly in their love for national liberty. I can wholeheartedly state that we in America are bound in bonds of unity to the people of Lithuania, and our effort continues to be for the restoration of national sovereignty and the return of freedom and liberty.

May this commemoration also serve to tell the people of Lithuania that we in America will never relax our efforts to help them secure their freedom and independence.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman from Illinois, who has always been with us in this program. He gives clear evidence of his interest in the Lithuanian people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his forthright statement with regard to the Lithuanian people and our enthusiastic dedication to the ultimate freedom of Lithuania. I should like to join with him and other Members not only to pay tribute to the people of Lithuania on the 43d anniversary of their freedom but also to express the hope that the day will not be too far away when Lithuania will again be free.

Today we pay tribute not only to the people of Lithuania who are living behind the Iron Curtain, holding together their national spirit in spite of Communist oppression, but we pay tribute as well to the fine Americans of Lithuanian descent who have contributed to our national life so much of the same burning ideals of freedom and patriotism which made their homeland so great.

Mr. Speaker, the fine people must gain hope not merely from any words that are spoken here on the floor of Congress today, but from the sentiments that were so eloquently expressed by our great President in his state of the Union message when he made it clear that regardless of the efforts that may be made to preserve the peace and freedom of the world and achieve some sort of working relationship with the Soviet Union, we have not by any means forgotten our friends in Lithuania and other countries that the Soviets today hold captive. I for one am proud that our President has pledged his administration, as we here on the floor of the Congress have pledged ourselves so many times before, to the cause of freedom in the not too distant future for all these brave people who are today held in oppression by their Soviet captors.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the honor of celebrating the 43d anniversary of the independence of the brave Lithuanian nation. Throughout the free world this is an occasion which we celebrate not only for ourselves but also for a people who cannot at the moment celebrate a freedom that once was their own.

In Lithuania today brave people are forced to lead a life which is as foreign to their character as the Russian oppressors should be to their country.

Since the 13th century Lithuania has enjoyed its freedom only for brief intervals between the conquests of power-hungry neighbors. Their years of struggle against the czarist regime finally regained for them their independence. This independence lasted less than a generation. In this generation a greater oppressor, with a more terrible power, grew in the East. And in 1940 the ugly head of tyranny, this time in the person of Joseph Stalin, once again cast its shadow over this noble country. The Lithuanian people again lost their independence.

The face of the tyrant has changed since 1940, but the lot of the Lithuanian people remains unimproved. They are still denied their freedom and independence.

But while the Kremlin can deny the freedom to work, talk, or travel as they please, the Lithuanian people still remain the masters of their own hopes; their own minds and souls. And within the Lithuanian people the passionate desire for freedom remains. This desire, that is a common heritage of the people of Lithuania and the people of the United States, forms a bond no Iron Curtain can break.

And, therefore, the privilege we have today of celebrating the Lithuanian independence, like all privileges, carries with it a responsibility. We here today, and the entire free world, have the heavy responsibility and the awesome challenge to be sure that someday Lithuania again will be free. We have this responsibility not only because Lithuania deserves her freedom, but also because the free world will not long remain free, if those who are free forget those who are not.

It is on this anniversary that the American people take the opportunity to tell the people of Lithuania that their plight is not forgotten and their hopes are also our hopes. This is an opportunity too to give notice to the Soviet jailers that we have not forgotten the brave people of Lithuania they hold as prisoners. The Kremlin may have released the RB-47 fliers. But we can let them know today that the people of the free world will continue to insist that they also free the enslaved people of Lithuania.

And so today is primarily a day to rededicate ourselves to the age-old struggle for freedom that has characterized the history of both the United States and of Lithuania, a struggle for the dignity of man, a struggle to free him from oppression of all kinds, a struggle full of hope for the coming day of deliverance.

Edward Markham once wrote in a poem dedicated to Abraham Lincoln whose birthdate we celebrated earlier this week:

And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down

As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

The end of Lithuanian independence back in 1940 left the same kind of empty void. Until the day when Lithuania once again is free, we shall hold a place for her in the family of all free nations. And until that place is filled, our important member of the family of free nations is missing and the dignity of man suffers to that extent.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the statements that are made today and hereafter in connection with the Lithuanian Day program will be reprinted in pamphlet form by the Lithuanian Information Center in New York City at a future date, and if there are any Members who do not wish to have their remarks and statements reprinted, they should so state during the course of today's program.

The Public Printer, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Clerk, the Committee on Printing, and the Lithuanian American Information Center will, by such an announcement as this, have the necessary authorization to have the reprints made in accordance with the rules and regulations on printing.

This will save a tremendous amount of time for the Members who are participating in today's program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the Record the remarks of my colleagues on this subject be inserted as follows—the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOWALSKI].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the blessing of liberty which we enjoy in this country should not blind us to the fact that oppression still exists in many parts of the world. We should be particularly mindful of this fact on February 16, the 43d anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence.

One of the first nations to be overwhelmed by Soviet power, Lithuania today stands as a reminder that the struggle for freedom will not be wholly won until this small, brave land is free of foreign domination.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence, the struggle of the Lithuanian peoples to achieve their independence is recalled to our minds with great vividness. Remembering the courage of the

Lithuanian peoples who live today under Communist domination, I wish particularly to praise the efforts of the Lithuanian-Americans who keep the memory of the independence of their fatherland before us. We owe much to those who remind us that many peoples of the world are not as lucky as we, but live under the domination of hostile rulers. Although the Lithuanian-Americans had to leave their country in time of stress, we rejoice that they selected the United States in which to live. They have enriched our culture with their artistic and intellectual talents, as well as with the work of their skilled hands and strong bodies. Through their Lithuanian groups and national organizations, they keep alive the spirit of Lithuanian independence from their adopted land, reminding us always of the oppression that exists in the world today. Let us celebrate this anniversary in the profound hope it will not always be so.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, ideals are important in the life of nations, and sometimes they are rated higher than mere material gains.

Individuals as well as nations do not live on bread alone; for their spiritual sustenance they cling to ideals. Freedom and independence are among the most cherished of these ideals. National independence is a condition under which group freedom may be attained, since it is difficult to conceive of freedom in a land where the people are subjected to a stern alien regime.

Late in the 18th century when Lithuanians lost their national independence and were brought under the czarist regime of Russia, they lost much of their individual freedoms. For more than a century these stalwart and stout-hearted Lithuanians suffered under the brutalities of czarist agents. During that unhappy period they did not lose sight of their objective: the attainment of their independence.

In 1918, that detested regime was overthrown. On February 16, 1918, Lithuanians proclaimed their independence. That day marked a turning point in their national history, for from then on a new day had dawned for them. The next two decades were to become a kind of golden age in Lithuania's modern history. The Lithuanians were justly proud of their splendid record of performance during those 2 peaceful decades in every walk of their national life. Unfortunately that happy interlude did not last long.

The Second World War proved to be a national tragedy for the Lithuanians. They were one of the first victims of that war. Communist dictators of Russia robbed them of their independence and of their freedom. During that war they suffered much and lost nearly all their worldly possessions, but they still had the hope of regaining their freedom after that war. In that expectation they were sadly disappointed. Even before the end of that war, the Red army made sure that Lithuania would remain part of the Soviet Union.

The unhappy upshot is that since 1945 Lithuania has become a prison camp for its helpless inhabitants. The country is almost completely sealed from the outside. No one except a few favored persons from the free world are allowed to enter, and of course no one is permitted to leave the country. There is no doubt that these years have been trying years for the people of Lithuania. They have lost all their worldly possessions, and they all are in the employ of the state, for the state owns and operates everything in that part of the Communist "paradise." It is unthinkable under such circumstances and under such a system to enjoy any freedom: freedom of speech, of assembly, and of movement is rigidly controlled. All activities of groups and individuals are closely watched, and everyone lives in constant fear of arrest and imprisonment. There is nothing for poor Lithuanians to do except work and pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

In voicing their genuine sentiments on the anniversary celebration of their independence day, I devoutly hope that freedom may again be theirs and that it will come in the near future.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was exactly 708 years ago that Lithuania first became a nation. Although it was a small country, the hopes, dreams, and ambitions of its courageous people more than made up for its size. For more than 540 years these people worked hard to develop Lithuania, and they succeeded. For out of their hopes, dreams, and ambitions was born peace and progress.

We all know what has happened to this once peaceful little country through the years. In the 18th century it was incorporated as part of czarist Russia. Its people were suppressed, held down for generations—and freedom became only a word without meaning. The Russian Revolution in 1918 made Lithuania free again. The nation proclaimed its independence on February 16, 1918, and there was peace once more. Unfortunately, it was short lived. Early in World War II Lithuania was again absorbed by the Russians. In time, the Red army was driven out by a then more powerful, equally tyrannical force—a Nazi army. Eventually, the Nazis, too, withdrew—and Russia was again firmly entrenched in Lithuania.

Through it all, the unquenchable spirit of the Lithuanian people has been kept alive by those same hopes, dreams, and ambitions that enabled them to build a flourishing, prosperous, and progressive nation many years ago.

On this February 16, the 43d anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, we in the United States join our prayers, our hopes, and our dreams with those of the Lithuanian people for peace and freedom in their proud little country. And with our prayers, our hopes, and our dreams, we include our profound respect and admiration for the courageous spirit of these people.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is one of the homelands presently dominated by a foreign conqueror. This sit-

uation is in direct violation of the principle of the "self-determination of peoples" which all of us in the free world value. We sympathize with the Lithuanian people wherever they are and we want them to know that neither they nor their unfortunate political situation has been forgotten.

Today marks the 43d anniversary of the independence of Lithuania achieved after World War I. This tiny country of noble people experienced two decades of freedom and liberty. Only when World War II came along was this nation with others the object of foreign conquest.

It is the sincere desire of all Americans and of freedom-loving people everywhere that the future may again see an independent Lithuania. Our efforts in the United Nations as in all our international endeavors must be directed to the achievement of freedom for all peoples everywhere.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, mankind's greatest menace, communism, rules one-fourth of the world's surface and one-third of the people. Amongst these people is the small nation of Lithuania, who today celebrate their 43d anniversary of their declaration of independence—in spite of the slave rule imposed upon them by communism. The celebration of this anniversary is the spark that is needed to fire up their ambitions to continue to work toward the day when they can again enjoy national independence with political and social justice.

We, in America, as the great symbol of democracy, must convey every word of encouragement to these brave people, to continue with vigor their quest for the God-given right to enjoy liberty and freedom. Let it be known today that the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Illinois are shouting to the brave Lithuanians to carry on their fight with renewed vitality. For in the end justice will prevail and they will once again join us as an independent nation opposed to any form of tyrant rule.

We, in America, have embarked on a new frontier, to advance our way of life to a level of great self-respect for all classes. This goal, that we are working for, will eventually lead to the destruction of all slave rule—set by good example and not forceful means. For no minority group possesses the power to enslave, when the full force of the majority works as a unit to rid the world of these sadistic principles. Only in a free world can we enjoy peace, prosperity, and full happiness.

I salute the inspiring example of resistance and determination shown by the Lithuanian people, and other captive nations behind the iron curtain, and denounce the Soviet Union for its brutality and imperialism.

The soul of Lithuania will never die, and it is my hope to see the day when these fine people again join the ranks of free nations.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, last year over a dozen countries in Africa were given their independence, among them the Congo. The tragic events that followed are only too well known to us all to recall here the slaying of Patrice

Lumumba by his rival forces, which may still have much deeper repercussions and consequences. I believe that the manner in which he and his two colleagues were killed is contrary to the concepts of our American democracy. However, the history of the independent Congo, its violence, and its present most complicated situation should be a lesson to all of us who help to gain liberty, independence, and justice for those who have never experienced it. There are those who believe that most of these newly born nations received their independence too soon. They say that one has to first educate them so that in the future they will be able to operate and administer their own government. We know that these backward countries cannot cope with their daily problems inside and abroad without the proper assistance. Yet it is the Soviet Government that exercises all the pressure upon us to back their demand for independence. Undoubtedly the Soviets are good salesmen in this respect and their propaganda has, psychologically speaking, had a tremendous effect on all those who have little knowledge of how the Soviet operates. The recent history of the Congo serves as a typical example. Lumumba, the Premier was released of his duties by his superior, the President. When violence broke out—instigated by Moscow—Lumumba was thrown in jail by his own people and the Soviets really screamed.

The Soviets blamed the United Nations for the events that have followed and they demanded that Dag Hammarskjöld be relieved of his duties as Secretary General of the United Nations, something which in itself is contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter. On this occasion, however, I would like to point out the Soviet Union's own record going back as far as 1939. Here are just some examples of the cynicism and treachery of that Government that calls itself the foremost frontline soldier in the battle for other oppressed nations.

First. On September 17, 1939, Stalin joined hands with Hitler in the name of mutual socialism by dividing Poland. As a result 1½ million Poles were deported deep into the Soviet Union's slave labor camps.

Second. Some 14,000 Polish officers—previously all mobilized to fight the German invaders—were coldbloodedly murdered by their Soviet captors in the Katyn Forest.

Third. Sixteen Polish underground leaders headed by General Okolnicki were lured into a plane under the pretext of being flown to London for a bipartisan meeting. Instead they all found themselves in the Lubianka Prison and were later court-martialed for anti-Soviet activities. Most of them were executed.

Fourth. The Hungarian revolution toppled everything. Soviet tanks rolling over Hungarian soil squelched the uprising, which the Soviet henchmen called an internal affair of the Hungarian people.

This is only a small part of the Soviet deeds.

As today we are celebrating the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania, our thoughts go back to this brave and wonderful nation, which became one of the many Soviet Republics. Most of its population, since the Soviets have occupied it, have been deported and there is still no end in sight to this tragedy. That is why I would suggest, for perhaps the hundredth time, why don't we ask the Khrushchevs, Zorins, and Gromykos, to lay off their hands in the Congo and grant liberty and independence to those non-Russian nations that have known and experienced independence for ages.

On this day when our Lithuanian people, outside that country, are able to celebrate their 43d anniversary of independence, this occasion would be most proper. Mr. Khrushchev, how long will you keep Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia enslaved.

As long as you are unable to answer that question, isn't it futile for you to talk about the Congo?

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of the First World War and soon after the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia, Lithuanians were among the first of many subject nationality groups to proclaim their national independence. That historic event of 43 years ago marked the culmination of their long-cherished dream, the regaining of their freedom, and ushered in a new era for them.

The Lithuanian people had lost their independence in the 18th century, but their real suffering under foreign domination began late in that century, when they were brought under the autocratic regime of Russia. Their country then became part of the Russian Empire, and they had to submit to the detested alien rule. Under the autocratic czarist regime they suffered materially and physically, but in all the subsequent misery and misfortune they were spiritually unscathed. The inefficient and unwieldy government of the czars could not stamp out Lithuanian national traits and feelings; autocratic and callous agents could not eliminate the Lithuanian spirit of freedom and independence. Stoutly and courageously these few million people held their own against the overwhelming power of the czars, and repeatedly defied Russian authorities whenever attempts were made to Russianize them, and thus submerge them in the one big Russian maelstrom. They were ready to sacrifice their all worldly possessions and, if necessary, submit to imprisonment and exile, but were unwilling to give up their beliefs and their national ideals. They clung to these tenaciously and steadfastly, and when the time came in 1918 to assert their independence, they seized upon the occasion and proclaimed the birth of the Lithuanian Republic. That was done on February 16, 43 years ago today.

Thenceforth for several years the people went through great difficulties. The war-ravaged country had to be built, the hungry had to be fed, the needy had to be cared for, and the governmental machinery just instituted had to be put

into efficient working order. Perhaps the most important and crucial of all was the organization of the country's defense forces for the maintenance of its newly won freedom. In time, however, these difficulties were overcome, many problems were solved, and Lithuania's independence safeguarded. In due time Lithuania became a member of the League of Nations, and played her part in world affairs. In the course of two decades, during the interwar years, it was regarded as a prosperous and progressive country. Unfortunately this happy situation did not last long; Lithuania's powerful and aggressive neighbors did not want it to last. Then as now, the deadliest and the most implacable of Lithuania's enemies was the Soviet Union, and the masters of the Kremlin saw to it that democratic Lithuania did not remain free and independent. The outbreak of the Second World War foreshadowed the doom, in the first instance, of all three Baltic Republics. Early in 1940, under a flimsy and outrageous pretext, Stalin's forces invaded and occupied the country, and in July of that year it was annexed to the Soviet Union.

During the war years Lithuanians suffered under both the Soviet regime and under the Nazis. While the Soviets were in occupation of the country many thousands of Lithuanians were exiled to distant parts of the Soviet Union, and those allowed to remain in their homeland were forced to work as slaves for their Communist overlords. Then for about 2 years the country was taken over by the Nazis, but this change hardly improved the lot of the Lithuanian people; they were compelled to work in Hitler's labor force to keep his fighting machinery going. Toward the end of the war the Communists returned once more, this time with more fury and ferocity. Since then the fate of Lithuania has been in the hands of the ruthless men in the Kremlin.

Today Lithuania is one large prison camp in which some 3 million helpless but courageous people are driven to work under wretched and miserable conditions for their Communist masters. All their worldly possessions are owned and operated by the state. They are the slaves of the most totalitarian dictatorship known to man. There they are deprived of all forms of freedom, and since they are practically sealed off from the outside world, we in the free world hear little of their actual status. Of one thing we can fortunately be certain: They have not given up their traditional and national ideals of freedom, and they cherish the hope that they will regain their national independence and be free of Communist totalitarianism. I join in the celebration of the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day and echo their genuine patriotic sentiment, their love of freedom and independence.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on this 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania, February 16, 1961, we once again hail Lithuanians the world over. Alas, we must again commiserate with them over the plight of their country. But, if the past points

the way, as we believe it does, we can hope with some confidence that this is a temporary plight. Lithuania has been a captive nation more than once. Each time she has been wrenched free. We believe she will again.

The present domination of this doughty little country dates from June 1940, when the Soviet regime was ruthlessly imposed upon her people. The U.S.S.R., with all of its anticolonial talk, perpetuates a domination far more heavy handed, far more restrictive, and far more distasteful to the native populace than any form of colonialism throughout the world. The colonies born to other countries in another era are fast being liberated or assisted toward self-government. The Soviet satellites, on the other hand, have in this generation had their fully developed independence and self-government taken from them.

There have been pretexts on the part of the Soviet Union that Communist domination has been adopted by choice in these countries. What a mockery of the freedom of choice for which these captive nations yearn. Their desire is to exercise their God-given right to enjoy self-determination. Their choice would be one of true freedom of liberty such as they have known and cherished in the past, of national independence with political and social justice.

When Lithuania gained that freedom and the birth of the nation which we now celebrate, it was a rebirth for that country. The name of Lithuania is centuries old. It was an entity old in the annals of Europe as no other name in the history of that continent save only the Basques. It was a country centuries before the powers of Europe that were to swallow it up had even come into being.

Russians, Poles, Germans have, through hundreds of years, overrun Lithuania. Politically it has been tossed about among them, fought over, conquered. But Lithuania has endured. Its identity has never been destroyed. Its soul has survived all misery and all subjugation. It must be reborn in the current movement of the entire human race toward liberation from evil.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, independence day is the most cherished holiday in the calendar of any free people. We Americans may sometimes seem to take for granted the freedom and independence we are privileged to continue to enjoy, but on the Fourth of July we take pause to give serious and grateful thought to the benisons of liberty. It is an occasion for rejoicing and thanksgiving. Today is the 43d anniversary of the attainment of liberty by Lithuania, but unlike our own celebration of Independence Day, the observance of this day by patriotic Lithuanians in their native land and here in the United States is blunted by the sad plight of their beloved country. There is no rejoicing or thanksgiving today in Lithuania. The independence that they achieved during World War I after years of subjugation under the Russian czars was short lived and was again lost to an even crueler domination

by the Russian dictators. Their annexation and incorporation into the Soviet Union has deprived them of any semblance of independence—for unlike Poland and other countries upon whom the Communists inflicted their peculiar form of "liberation" the Lithuanians do not even have a puppet government of their own.

The valiant Lithuanian people who during a century of Russian dominance dreamed of freedom still foster that dream. Along with their aspirations for liberty they have continued to adhere to their native culture despite the Russian attempts to impose foreign ideologies and customs upon them. When they again attain their longed-for independence, they will have intact their eternal love of country, customs, and freedom. Despite the practice of brainwashing which may temporarily deprive an individual of the use of his God-given free will and intellect, it is virtually impossible to control the minds of an entire people, and the brave Lithuanian people will not permit themselves to be bereft of their intellectual and cultural heritage. The renowned poet has said, "Hope springs eternal in the human breast," and in the people of Lithuania hope triumphs over their tragic experience.

Today, we in the United States should also give pause and extend to the brave Lithuanians our own heartfelt wishes that the day will come when they again can experience the blessings of independence. Let them know that their tragic plight is not forgotten by us while we enjoy our own liberty, for we know that while tyranny exists any place in the world our freedom is threatened. We bid them never to surrender hope and always to cling to their beloved culture.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on this February 16, 1961, we once again celebrate, rather ironically, another anniversary of the Declaration of Independence that created the free State of Lithuania. It is now 43 years since the Lithuanians availed themselves of the privilege of a free people to control their own destinies and established the Lithuanian Republic.

For a number of years thereafter Lithuania held its rightful place and added its contribution to the free nations of the world. All this has passed since that fateful month of June 1940, when Red communism and Soviet tyranny ruthlessly and viciously swept over Lithuania and blanketed this land with the dark blight of Soviet aggression.

Since that time Lithuania and the Lithuanian people have been held in bondage behind the Iron Curtain, suffering untold miseries under their despotic rulers. Their Soviet masters would have us believe that Lithuania freely accepted communism. We here who are privileged to have the right to raise our voice in the free assemblies of this earth know differently. We know that Lithuania and the Lithuanians along with millions of others in the enslaved nations in both the eastern and western sections of our world are awaiting anxiously the day when there will be a rebirth of freedom in their lands and they once again may

have the privilege and right to control their own destinies.

It is to the credit of our Government and the American people that never once have we wavered in our policy of supporting the principle of freedom for all captive nations. We rightfully continue to refuse to recognize "dejure" the invalid and unjust annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet.

May we on this 43d anniversary once again reaffirm our belief in the rights of freedom that we cherish so dearly under our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution and may we hope that in the inexorable movement of time once again Lithuania and the Lithuanian people will be their own masters in their own house.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence occurs at a time when our Nation is embarking on a new era and under a new leadership. Let us hope it will prove to be an era of freedom for all peace-loving nations, including the captive and enslaved nations suffering under the yoke of communism.

I hope and trust that in the near future the United States and the free world will regain the initiative in world affairs and that they will once again play a leading role in shaping those affairs in the best interests of all mankind. It is of utmost importance that in the developing concept of the New Frontier we should not forget the captive nations of Eastern Europe, who have been the first and greatest victims of international communism.

The people of Lithuania are today a silenced people, unable to speak their mind, unable to practice their religious beliefs, unable to celebrate their anniversary, unable to live as a free and independent nation. Their indomitable will for freedom, however, has not been crushed. They are waiting silently and grimly, yet patiently and hopefully for the future.

This indomitable will, this grim patience and hope, must be kept alive under all circumstances. To give up, to lose courage, means to lose all hope. This would constitute national suicide. Its effect would be felt not only by the people of Lithuania, but it would affect free people everywhere. Lithuania thus is a symbol of the struggle against mankind's greatest and most ruthless enemy. We must encourage this nation, and all other nations similarly situated, to maintain their hope, and to continue their gallant struggle. In this way, they are rendering a great and lasting service to humanity and civilization.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania. Over the years it has been my custom to speak here in the House of Representatives on this historic occasion and to join with my colleagues to pay tribute to the courageous founders of that republic.

Any attempt to recite in detail the many highlights of Lithuania's great history would certainly be beyond my ability. The story has been told and retold. The valiant deeds of Lithuanian

men and women of the past have been repeated over and over again—particularly those deeds of fathers and mothers who have kept alive the fire of freedom which was Lithuania's first love. So also the deeds of children who refused to let Lithuania die in spite of the most concerted efforts in history to destroy all trace of a nation and a people.

The contribution of the Lithuanians in America and their descendants gives us some idea of the national vitality of that country. It is an indication that confidence and faith in Lithuania's future is well placed. The distinctive culture, the deep-rooted traditions, and the rich folklore of the Lithuanian people have greatly enriched our own country. Their contribution has been magnificent and I am proud that so many of them are citizens of my State of Rhode Island.

To the many persons of Lithuanian descent and origin I extend my congratulations on this—the anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. On this day, of so much significance to all Lithuanians, I join my hopes with theirs that their mother country may soon be delivered from its present domination and become again a free and independent nation.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 43d anniversary of Lithuania's independence, the day on which oppressed Lithuanians asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence. Today, though the freedom they regained and the independence they proclaimed are no more, and the Republic they founded in their historic homeland was smothered by the Red army more than 20 years ago, yet that historic date is not without significance. That memorable day became a great turning point in Lithuania's national history, ushered in a new and better era for the Lithuanian people, and has become their national holiday.

It is with fervent yearning that all freedom-loving Lithuanians who are permitted to celebrate the anniversary of this day, observe it annually with due solemnity wherever they may be. They devoutly hope that their kinsmen imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain in Lithuania and suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny, will again have the freedom to do the same there. In the expression of this genuine patriotic sentiment I gladly join all loyal Americans of Lithuanian ancestry and hope that soon Lithuanians regain their freedom in their beloved homeland and there enjoy the blessings of peace.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanians constitute one of the small nations in Europe, but they have their distinct place in Europe's history. For centuries their little country in the Baltic area formed a powerful kingdom. Late in the 18th century their country was brought under the Russian czar, and they were subjected to his autocratic regime. For more than 100 years they lived under this detested alien rule, and during all that time they worked for their freedom. Their efforts and sacrifices had their reward in 1918. When the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, there was nothing to prevent the

Lithuanians from regaining their freedom. This they did early in 1918. They proclaimed their independence on February 16 and founded the Lithuanian Republic.

During the next two decades, a happy interlude of interwar years, they enjoyed their freedom and worked hard to safeguard it against all threatening dangers. But when that danger came, early in the last war, they were not in a position to cope with it. The powerful and aggressive Red army overran Lithuania, and robbed its people of their freedom. Since those fateful days these staunch fighters for freedom have been suffering under the tyrannical regimes of dictators. Today they are practically imprisoned in their historic homeland, and are deprived of all freedoms. They do not have the freedom to observe their national holiday, their independence day. As friends of Lithuania, we in the free world commemorate this great national holiday and express the hope that soon they will once more regain their freedom.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, freedom and independence, democracy, and popular government were the goals for which the First World War was waged. And as far as small and oppressed peoples were concerned, some of these goals were attained. When that war ended, autocracies in Europe were overthrown and long oppressed nationality groups attained their independence. The Lithuanians were one of these.

When the detested and decrepit czarist regime, under which they had suffered for more than a century, was shattered by the Russian Revolution, they felt free and proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918. Then they established the Lithuanian Republic, rebuilt their war-torn country, strengthened democratic institutions, made progress in nearly every walk of life and proved themselves fully worthy of their freedom. In due time Lithuania was admitted into the League of Nations, and in that world organization its spokesmen always advocated peace.

Thus the Lithuanians were quite content with their lot and lived in friendship with their neighbors; they were on good terms even with their implacable enemy, the Communist Russians. This happy period came to an abrupt end by the outbreak of the last war. Early in 1940, when all friends of Lithuania were involved in that war, the Red army invaded Lithuania, occupied it, and later it became part of the Soviet Union. Thus ended the independent Lithuanian Republic, and then began the enslavement of the Lithuanian people.

Since those fateful days, for more than 20 years, Lithuanians have not known freedom. During the war they had hoped that after that war they would be given their freedom. But they were rudely shocked when, in the end instead of being free and independent, they found themselves behind the then shaping Iron Curtain. There in their historic homeland they are held today a satellite of a foreign power, dominated by a Communist totalitarianism. During all these years they have been hoping and pray-

ing for their deliverance. They have not given up hope for their eventual independence and freedom, and they still continue to pray to that end. In joining them in this prayer on the 43d anniversary of their independence day, I wish these stouthearted people fortitude, patience, and power.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, again we gather in this historic Chamber to pledge our hearts and our unceasing efforts to the cause of a free and independent Lithuania.

Men and women of Lithuanian blood have made a mighty contribution in our own United States in literature, in music, in art, in education, in religion, in the trades and in the professions, in the living of good lives filled with good deeds. They have enriched the United States of which they are an inseparable part.

It would be strange if on this anniversary day the thought of all Americans were not focused on the brave land of Lithuania. Today we, the Representatives of the American people, meet in this Chamber again to send to the enslaved men, women, and children a message of hope and of the assurance of a true friend that we shall not cease in the struggle until again Lithuania is free.

The 43d anniversary celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day marks hope for the dawn of a new day for all oppressed peoples in Eastern Europe. For the Lithuanian people this day commemorates February 16, 1918, when they asserted their freedom, proclaimed their independence of Russia, and set up the Lithuanian Republic. Then struggling against economic and financial hardships and faced with diplomatic difficulties, they made the best of a very precarious situation and succeeded in pulling themselves up by their bootstraps, establishing stability, and bringing about prosperity. They were happy in freedom, and all worked hard to continue to improve their democratic Republic.

This happy interlude lasted for two decades, but then the forces of evil over which they had no control stared them in the face. Their implacable enemy and the deadliest danger to their independence, the Soviet Red Army, overran Lithuania early in 1940, robbed the people of their freedom, and the country became part of the Soviet Union.

Since those fateful days the history of the Lithuanian people has been marked by tragic events. While expecting suffering during the war, they had hoped that with the end of that war their misery and suffering would also come to an end. But even before the termination of the war the Soviet Union's unrelenting hold over Lithuania was tightened. And so it is today; some 3 million Lithuanians are still groaning under Communist totalitarian tyranny in their homeland.

Recently, there has been some talk about the relaxation of Soviet controls over Lithuania. There have even been occasional reports emanating from Soviet sources that there has actually

been a considerable degree of freedom given to Lithuania and surrounding lands in the Baltics. Unfortunately, however, these unfounded reports tend to cover up the sad facts that these stout-hearted lovers of freedom are still subjected to alien rule, still held down by the agents of the Kremlin in their historic homeland. Let us all express the hope that soon they will really attain liberty and celebrate their independence day freely in their beloved Lithuania.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 16, was the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania—a small but noble Baltic nation that was set free from foreign domination in the earthquake changes marking the closing months of the First World War. Many millions of people here and in other lands think that this is an anniversary that free nations everywhere should observe with appropriate ceremonials.

The freedom that the Lithuanian people gained in 1918 has now been taken from them again. Along with the other Baltic States, they were forcibly embodied into the Soviet Union following military occupation under the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939.

There was the farce of so-called elections following the occupation, but the presence of the Soviet military was the proof that the Kremlin did not dare allow elections and plebiscites that were truly free.

Americans of Lithuanian descent find great gratification, I am sure, in the steadfast refusal of the United States to acknowledge the control of Lithuania by the Soviet Union as a lawful and legally constituted regime.

Lithuanians, like other captive peoples, still yearn for national independence under a government that seeks social and political justice. Lithuanians wish to enjoy the God-given right of all men to liberty and freedom. And their desire poses a very simple question: If the Soviet Union is sincere about opposition to colonialism, why does it not permit Lithuania and other captive nations of the Baltic and of Eastern Europe freedom from Soviet rule?

Many Members of this House, I am certain, join in the celebration of this day that lives in the memory of the Lithuanian people. Many share the hope that in the developments of time, the citizens of this brave country will once again breathe the heady air of freedom and feel the sense of exaltation that arises from self-rule, self-government, and national self-determination.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the brave and suffering people of Lithuania are marking the 43d anniversary of their declaration of independence today.

February 16, 1917, is just as significant to Lithuanians as July 4, 1776, is to every American. It was February 16, 1917, that the rebirth of that small and gallant Baltic state took place.

Today the anniversary serves again to point up the terrible sufferings which Lithuanians have undergone since 1940 when that country was occupied and taken over by the Communists.

While we here in America continue to enjoy our priceless freedom, communistic treachery has deprived Lithuanians of their independence and has subjugated this Baltic country to a state of slavery.

But even though a large part of the Lithuanian population has been deported to slave camps in Siberia to die of starvation, these wonderful freedom-loving people still carry on resistance to their oppressors.

Their martyrdom only serves to keep patriotism alive.

Year after year Members of Congress honor this brave country on this date. This date, however, also should serve for each one of us in Government as a day for us to renew our pledge to be increasingly insistent in demands on Russia that she restore liberty to Lithuania and other oppressed countries under the yoke of communism as proof of her intentions to cooperate for worldwide peace.

The persecutions and atrocities inflicted on the people of Lithuania must never be ignored. The United States must continue to refuse to grant diplomatic recognition to the government of the so-called Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. Not only today, but every day throughout the year Lithuanians look to the United States as a citadel of human freedom and for leadership in bringing about their liberation and a permanent independence.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, out of the ruins and destruction caused by the First World War rose the three independent and sovereign Baltic Republics, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The peoples of these three countries had been groaning for more than a century under Russian autocracy. That autocracy was overthrown in 1917, and early in 1918 these peoples proclaimed their independence. The Lithuanians did so on February 16, founded their Republic based on democratic institutions, and then did their utmost to strengthen their newly born state. For two decades, while there seemed no imminent danger from foreign enemies, they fared extremely well. They lived in peace with their neighbors and, though apprehensive of Communist Russia's evil designs against their country, they were content with their lot. Then came World War II, and with it the end of their independence and freedom.

Early in 1940 the Red army overran Lithuania, just as it did Estonia and Latvia, and by the middle of the year it became part of the Soviet Union. Since then the unfortunate Lithuanians have not known freedom. They themselves have not been able to win it back, and their friends in the free world, much against their wish, have not been able to help them directly to regain their freedom. Though they are suffering under the Kremlin's totalitarianism, the Lithuanians have not given up hope for their eventual freedom. For their steadfastness and stolidity we admire these stalwart champions of freedom, and on the 43d anniversary of their independence day which was celebrated yesterday we

hope that they eventually secure liberty and peace in their homeland.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. For centuries the unhappy Lithuanians did not have the good fortune to enjoy freedom in their homeland. During most of their modern history they have been subjected to unwanted and detested alien rulers, and their valiant attempts to cast off foreign regimes were of no avail until 1918. Then in the overthrow of the decrepit czarist regime they saw their chance, seized upon it, and proclaimed their independence on February 16 of that year. Thus was founded the Lithuanian Republic.

Thenceforth, for about two decades the Lithuanians lived in freedom, worked hard, and succeeded in making their little country in the Baltic a happy home. Mostly through their own efforts they overcame acute economic difficulties; domestic social problems were solved, and even with their implacable enemies they lived in peace. Then came the Second World War, which not only threatened their sovereignty but also put an end to their freedom. Early in 1940 the country was overrun by the Red army; it was then made part of the Soviet Union and its inhabitants became subject to its tyranny. The course of the war did not alter their status, and by 1945 Communist totalitarianism was tightly fastened upon them by the tyrants of the Kremlin. Today that is their unenviable lot: to suffer and work under Communist tyranny in their homeland, and cherish the hope of liberation in the not too distant future. We share their genuine sentiments and wish to see them attain their goal, freedom from tyranny.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 16, was the 43d anniversary of Lithuania's proclamation of independence and I rise to reaffirm my deep and warm friendship for the gallant people of Lithuania as we observe this most solemn occasion.

It is a solemn occasion, rather than a jubilant celebration, because of the tyrants who rule Soviet Russia. It has become traditional in this body that we pay tribute to the freedom-loving people of Lithuania on their Independence Day. And it also must be traditional that we repeat and repeat the story of how the Lithuanians lost their independence so that people throughout the world never will forget the aims and actions of the Communists.

The story of Lithuania and the throttling of its independence is a tragic one. It should be a lesson to all nations of the world, both large and small, which flirt with the ideology of communism, and which consider entering into pacts, treaties, or agreements with them.

It was with great dreams that Lithuania proclaimed its independence on February 16, 1918, to bring to an end 123 years of servitude to imperialistic Russia. It was then that the light of liberty was rekindled in Lithuania. Its people were free. They could now bring about the realizations of their dreams, hopes, and ambitions.

However, freedom was short lived for the Lithuanians. On the dark day of June 15, 1940, the Soviet Russian Army marched into Lithuania, bringing a new Russian imperialism and Communist tyranny to the struggling nation.

The Russian action was in complete violation of all treaties, including its own mutual assistance pact with Lithuania that guaranteed Lithuania independence and of Russian noninterference in the domestic, social, and economic order of that nation. This, of course, is typical of the masters of the Kremlin—both past and present. Treaties, pacts, and agreements have meant nothing to them. The seizure of Lithuania should forever be a lesson, a tragic one, to the world of the intent and purposes of the Communists.

Yet, despite all their trials and tribulations under the Communist yoke, the Lithuanian love for liberty has not died. They wait patiently and with determination for the day when they will be free again; when again Lithuania will be able to take its place with the free nations of the world.

Thus, today may we all join in extending our sympathy and friendship to these brave people, who had made such magnificent strides as a free nation. May we also join in prayer with these courageous people that the day of deliverance for Lithuania soon will be realized and that the light of freedom will glow once more over their land.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania is celebrated on February 16, but the ruthless Soviet regime still is imposed upon this country, depriving its people of their freedom. However, such oppression will never deprive Lithuania of its exalted spirit of liberty. As time passes the free world more and more appreciates the devotion that Lithuanians in exile have for their native land, and by their persistent and continued efforts their flame of independence is kept bright and is a shining example to all nations that love their freedom.

On their anniversary date the Lithuanians who are in this country once again reaffirm that Lithuania wants its national independence with political and social justice; she wants the free exercise of her God-given right to enjoy liberty and freedom, and I am convinced that the people of America are inspired and thrilled at such patriotic devotion. May we Americans rededicate ourselves at this time to the preservation of independence, not only for ourselves but for all nations everywhere, to the end that equal justice and self-government may be recaptured once again by the enslaved peoples of the world. By so doing we will not only strengthen ourselves, but will add hope and courage to those who are oppressed.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, drowned in the rabid and noisy shouts from the Kremlin about alleged imperialism in Africa are the cries of the millions of formerly free peoples Russia herself has enslaved. Nikita Khrushchev's histrionic demands for the self-determination of all people are

but empty attempts to hide from the world the slaughter of those in his own colonies.

All of us can recall the savage Soviet assault on Hungary when that hapless country attempted to throw off the Red yoke, but few remember that there are behind the Iron Curtain other lands whose people cry out for freedom.

Among these, Mr. Speaker, is the tiny Baltic state of Lithuania, a nation half the size and containing less than one-fifth the population of my own State of New York.

Because Lithuanian culture is deeply rooted in Christian principle and freedom, the shackles of Soviet serfdom cut deep. I believe I can speak for Americans everywhere when I say we look with unyielding hope to the day when the Lithuanian people will be freed of their bonds and may again breathe the clean, pure air of independence.

Although Lithuania was an independent state as early as the 13th century, it later became a Grand Duchy of czarist Russia. Just 43 years ago, it proclaimed its independence and was recognized as a free nation by most of the world's great powers. In 1920, its capital city, Vilna, and more than 10,000 square miles of its territory were occupied by the Poles.

The return of most of this territory in 1939, however, signaled only short-lived joy, for a year later Russian armies occupied Lithuania and annexed it to the Soviet Union.

Thus, for more than 20 years, Lithuania has been nothing more than a colony of Communist Russia.

Throughout the world, on this date Lithuanians who fled before the Red terror and nationals of Lithuanian descent have joined the captive people in their fatherland in a prayer for liberation. In this country, observance of independence will be led by a committee of Lithuanian-Americans organized for the purpose.

I consider it highly fitting, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of this body take part today in this silent prayer for Lithuanian independence and freedom.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 16, 1961, was the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania and on this memorable occasion I pay tribute to all the people of Lithuania and all Americans of Lithuanian descent.

It is said that the Lithuanians guard three things in their lives most precious: First, their beautiful language; second, their love of a closeness to nature; and third, their appreciation of the beauty in everyday life. But appreciation of these things comes with more difficulty when a people have been deprived of freedom of expression, of self-determination, and of the right to enjoy those three things. In 1940, after 20 years of self-won independence, Lithuania was overrun by the Russian Communists. Since World War II Lithuanians have been living under their domination.

Lithuania today is more than just one of the Eastern European countries that has been overrun by the Communists.

It has become a symbol of all those countries and its people a symbol for all the people whose love of independence and individuality has been subjugated to tyranny. What is even more important, the Lithuanian people represent a spirit of independence that can be kept alive in the face of such tyranny. In their love of beauty, nature, and simplicity they represent all the good that can come out of the filth of oppression.

One of the underlying strengths of the Lithuanian people is the land itself. Like the people, it has sustained numerous invasions without ever losing its basic beauty, strength, or vitality. In a land that never changes, that is always a sustaining factor in their lives, the Lithuanians are able to maintain their heritage and their independence of thought, in spite of political domination.

I am told that Lithuania is a surprisingly beautiful land, of flat grain-covered plains and hills rolling away into the distance. For a land that has felt the alien feet of so many conquering soldiers it has worn well and carries its beauty with grace. The lake regions, totaling over 150,000 acres of water surface, frequently occur unexpectedly in the gently rolling plains. The swift rivers flow throughout the country, carrying its produce and prosperity. The forests, thick and deep, are the backbone of the flat land of patchwork farms. The farm houses are of traditional wood with ornamentation and embellishments. Along the country roads are scattered beautifully carved wooden crosses and wayside shrines.

A modern poet has written about Lithuania:

Who does not remember his boyhood, gun on shoulder
Whistling through unobstructed fields?
Overstepping the bounds, yet offending no leaseholder
Of Lithuania, where the chase was free?

This seems to express the spirit that was Lithuania's between the First and Second World Wars. Those were joyous years for the little independent country. It was a time when they were building a small nation among a league of helpful and friendly powers. But it was also a prophetic time; after so long it was almost too good to be true. Nevertheless, during that period the Lithuanian people realized that independence they had sought so long.

That independence, lost in 1940, is kept alive by Lithuanians living throughout the free world. They keep alive the language, the love of nature, and the love of beauty in life's daily rewards. If the Lithuanian-Americans cannot return to their native land, they enrich our culture with the benefits of that small and tranquil country. They reward us with the work of their hands, as artisans and workers. They teach of the folklore and folkways of Lithuania. They lift their voices in praise of their land and of ours. It is not surprising that they cry out:

When will the Lord God give us return,
Inhabit
Ancestral fields, bear arms
Against the birds, and only to ride down
the rabbit
Must our horse?

On this day of their independence, let them cry more loudly. Let all the world hear the anguished cries of the captive people. And let them all know the name of their country, Lithuania, with pride and compassion and hope.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians form one of the three nationality groups in the Baltic countries. Numbering 3 million in all they are the most populous of the three Baltic peoples. Partly for that reason they have played a very important part in the history of northeastern Europe. For centuries their kingdom was a powerful force in the whole Eastern Europe. At times they not only successfully repelled some of the incursions of barbarian invaders from the East, but they also were champions and formed a formidable advance guard of Christianity in that outpost of Europe. Late in the 16th century the Lithuanian kingdom was united with that of Poland, thus forming a dual monarchy. In this union Lithuania was the junior partner; it lasted for more than two centuries, and during that time the destiny of the two countries were one. Near the end of the 18th century when Poland was partitioned, Lithuania became part of the Russian Empire. That was the end of the Lithuanian kingdom, the end of freedom for the Lithuanian people.

This loss of national independence did not mean the loss of the Lithuanian desire for freedom and independence. For more than 100 years under czarist domination they struggled for their national goal. They combatted czarist oppression with the means at their disposal, and they succeeded in keeping alive the national spirit among the mass of the people. They fought the Russian regime covertly and sometimes openly. At times they organized popular uprising and revolts against their oppressors, but they had to wait until the First World War for the actual achievement of their independence. Soon after the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia, they proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918, and founded the Lithuanian Republic.

Under their democratic government they enjoyed freedom for two decades and lived happily in their free and rebuilt country. In the 1930's when the dictators in Europe started saber rattling, all small countries became apprehensive. Since none of these relatively weak countries could defend itself against powerful Nazis or aggressive Communist Russians, they all were in fear of their independent existence. Unfortunately their apprehensions proved justified. Soon after the outbreak of the last war all these small and helpless countries became easy victims of unbridled aggression. Lithuania was invaded by the Red army early in 1940, Lithuanians lost their freedom and their country became part of the Soviet Union. Lithuanians were not in position to resist their implacable enemies and none of Lithuania's friends was in position to be of any assistance. During the war they endured the oppressive rule of both the Communists and the Nazis, but they hoped that at the end of the war their ordeal should come to

an end. Unfortunately, instead of regaining their freedom, the chain which held them in bondage during the war years was tightened, and they were brought once more under the unrelenting rule of Communist totalitarianism.

Today these helpless people live under Soviet tyranny. They are robbed of their lands, and much of their worldly possessions; there they work under oppression for their taskmasters and pray for their deliverance. Such is their unenviable lot. On this 43d anniversary celebration of their independence day let us hope for their delivery from Soviet totalitarian oppression.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the birth of the Lithuanian Republic in 1918 represented the culmination of a century-old dream. For more than 100 years the stalwart and stouthearted people of Lithuania, while suffering under Russian autocracy had worked for this goal. When the dreaded czarist regime in Russia collapsed Lithuanians were prepared to assert their freedom and proclaim their independence. This they did on February 16, 1918. That was a turning point in Lithuania's modern history, one that ushered in a new day for the Lithuanian people.

The Lithuanian Republic thus founded was strengthened by the unstinting labors and untold sacrifices of the people. They all were proud of their freedom, ready to defend it at all costs and against all comers. But it did not occur to them that when the evil day fell upon them, they would be totally incapable of saving themselves from the clutches of their implacable enemy, the Soviet Union. Unfortunately that day came very early in the last war, and with it began their national tragedy. In 1940 they were robbed of their independence and their fate was placed in the hands of Communist bosses in the Kremlin.

That has been, and unfortunately still is, the sad lot of the Lithuanian people. In that unhappy situation their one sustaining hope is freedom from their heartless oppressors. On the celebration of their independence day I wish them more power and share in their hope for freedom from Communist tyranny.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, of the many striking and heartrending facts of the two World Wars, two stand out: at the end of the first millions of people who were held down under autocracies for centuries regained their freedom, but at the conclusion of the last war nearly all of those who had thus gained freedom in 1918-19 lost it and much else. That is a sad commentary on the last and greatest of wars.

The Lithuanians had regained their freedom from the czarist regime after Russian autocracy was overthrown by the Bolsheviks. They had proclaimed their independence, had instituted their own democratic government, and there they were working and living happily. They were allowed to enjoy their freedom for about two decades, then came the Second World War, and with it the end of their independence. All this was done by their implacable enemy the Communist bosses in the Kremlin. Early in 1940 the Red army occupied Lithuania, suppressed all freedom there,

and then the country became part of the Soviet Union, a province of that sprawling empire. Since then unhappy Lithuanians have been living under the yoke of Communist totalitarian dictatorship. These some 3 million stout-hearted lovers of freedom are driven to work for their taskmasters. Grudgingly and unwillingly they perform their imposed duty, and devoutly pray for their deliverance from Soviet tyranny. Under the uncertainty of prevailing international situation unfortunately the friends of Lithuanians could do very little to help the unfree people of Soviet-dominated Lithuania. We ardently hope that they will soon regain their freedom and celebrate their independence day in their historic homeland.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the independence of Lithuania restored. I do not believe in efforts by some people who think we can coexist with Soviet Russia. Once we, or the free world, accept that philosophy then it is certain Lithuania, and other countries which have been incorporated into the Soviet Union, will never become free nations again.

I feel the time is long since past when the United States, and our allies, must let Soviet Russia know that in any dealings or negotiations that take place, it must be borne in mind that our objective is to have free elections in each one of the countries, such as Lithuania, to reestablish a government by the Lithuanian people and that they have a free government.

Lithuania and other countries have suffered too much and we cannot settle for halfway measures. I do not see how any summit conference, or negotiations leading up to one, can compromise the freedom of the people of Lithuania. Let us hope that action will be had and that our prayers will help bring this about at an early time.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, nearly 21 years have passed since the forces of Soviet Russia swept through the land of the Lithuanian people and incorporated that nation into the Soviet empire. Since the 13th century, this small but hardy land has enjoyed alternating periods of liberty with self-government and oppressive subjugation. Yet the bright spark of freedom which even today keeps alive the spirit of the Lithuanian people, despite a new Soviet occupation, has never died within their hearts.

It was on February 16, 1918, after 123 years of Russian domination, that the Lithuanian people once again proclaimed their independence and proceeded with vigor and renewed faith to attain notable progress in all spheres of national activity. This vital, liberty-loving people worked hard to raise the standard of their well-being. Under self-government and freedom, they contributed much to the social, economic, cultural, and scientific progress of Europe. The Lithuanian Republic became a respected member of the family of free nations.

When 21 years ago the Soviets broke their pledge to respect the independence of Lithuania, and used military force once more to suppress these people, the free world was shocked. I am happy to

say that the Government of the United States quickly denounced this action.

Today the voices of the people of Lithuania are silenced, but we know that their historic battle for liberty continues despite the oppression and tyranny which prevails throughout their land. The flame of national pride and determination to regain independence as a nation will not quickly die in the hearts of these people. In truth, such emotions can never die among those who once anywhere have tasted and enjoyed the fruits of freedom.

It is our privilege today to honor the Lithuanians in our own free land, as well as those in their native country. Great, too, has been their contribution to our own knowledge of freedom: great their contribution to the development and progress of our economy and our culture.

In commemorating this happy day in the history of Lithuania, we hail again the courage and conviction of a freedom-loving people. We pray with them that their freedom will be regained and that the Republic of Lithuania will once again take its place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 16, marked the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

This Republic's life was short lived for barely had 20 years of freedom and independence passed when the dark shadow of Communist tyranny was cast over Lithuania.

The peace-loving people of Lithuania were and are presently subjugated to a philosophy which denies the dignity of man and deprives him of his freedom. However, the brave people of Lithuania have never lost sight of their fierce desire for liberty and are working relentlessly to lift the yoke of Communist oppression from their land. Other captive nations can take great courage from the example given by this nation's will and determination to regain national independence.

It gives me great pride to join today with my colleagues in paying tribute to the brave people of Lithuania who have suffered under Communist tyranny since 1940. Let us hope that the sympathy and understanding of the free world is of some comfort to them.

We of the free world must reaffirm our wholehearted interest and support to the aspirations of these suffering people so that they might once again attain and enjoy freedom.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary celebration of the restoration of an independent Lithuania was highly significant to all of us. Not only because we are a people who celebrate all occasions of freedom, wherever they may occur in the world, but because we are forced to see in yesterday's celebration a powerful contrast of moving importance.

There was no open celebration in Lithuania yesterday. Their conquerors saw to that. No bells rang, no bands played, and no one dared march in a parade. The only celebration in Lithuania was in the hearts and upon the hearths. In the hearts of all who go

on hoping for a new freedom, and upon the hearths as religious men and women knelt to pray that God once again will lift the Iron Curtain of their bondage. All of this they are forced to do silently.

Our country is alive with controversy as well as celebration. But one thing is certain: there will be no silence. Across our land, the oppressed rise up in Congress, in the streets, on our pulpits and in the press to cry out against their oppressors. Humble citizens shout their criticisms against us in Congress, against the President of the United States, against our captains of industry and labor, and against leadership wherever citizens believe it to be failing. They are free to do so.

Next Fourth of July, our bands will play, our bells will ring and our people will march in celebration of the freedom we still possess. There will be no silence.

This is the compelling contrast for us in America, as we salute a freedom lost to the Lithuanians. At the same time, the irony of yesterday's celebration should make us ever more zealous in the premise that we shall prosper in the strength of our own freedom only so long as we make it indestructible for all our citizens; that we shall be safe in our own freedom, only so long as we are willing to secure it for the people of Lithuania and all the world.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. Again we are reminded that Lithuania is not free but still a captive nation subjugated to the tyrannical rule of Russia.

Of those 43 years Lithuania has passed 20 under Communist domination. Prior to its achievement of independence in 1918, Lithuania had been under czarist rule since 1795. Twenty years of free government out of more than 200 years of Russian rule is not a very great space of time. However, that those few years could generate such a nationalistic fervor and could delineate such an individual culture is significant.

Throughout the various alien rules, Lithuania has been able to preserve its own heritage and its will for freedom. It has never succumbed to anything but the militarily enforced political domination of the alien rulers. Its folk music and folk art, its literature and history have all been preserved, as are those of any free nation. Today Lithuanian-Americans do much to keep these elements of their homeland intact. While we celebrate the anniversary of Lithuanian political independence, we also celebrate the continuing contributions of Lithuanians throughout the world to the free world. In that, there is a certain independence of mind and spirit that transcends political subjugation.

It is a pleasure to join the many friends of Lithuania in the House today in paying tribute to the brave people of Lithuania, and to reaffirm as strongly as it is possible for me to do so my position that Lithuania be aided in her just cause for freedom.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity once again to pay tribute to the people of

Lithuania, enslaved behind the Iron Curtain for these many years.

On February 16, 1918, 43 years ago yesterday, Lithuania proclaimed her independence after years of Russian domination. This independence lasted only a little over 20 years, when the country was again seized by Soviet Russia in 1940.

On this anniversary date we must renew our pledge to work tirelessly and endlessly toward the goal of freedom for all the victims of Communist tyranny. We must encourage these peoples to keep the torch of liberty burning brightly so that one day they may again take their place among the free nations of the world. That is why it is so important for us here in Congress to express our sentiments against such godless dictatorship, and to celebrate for the Lithuanians in their homeland this important anniversary.

I pray that this independence can be regained for them in the not too distant future.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania, one of the Baltic States, declared her independence. Communist Russia, with traditional disregard for the rights of national self-determination, seized the territory and institutions of Lithuania in June 1940.

Lithuania now stands as abiding testimony against those who would have us believe that the world's problems can be erased by simply signing one nonaggression or peaceful coexistence pact after another with the Soviets. The Lithuanians were the first to suffer the results of Stalin's infamous pact with Hitler which erupted into the holocaust of World War II.

The Lithuanians' undiminished refusal to conform to evil and their hope for eventual deliverance are an inspiration to oppressed people and an incentive for free nations to protect their liberties all the more strongly. The Russians cannot quench the traditional Lithuanian pride of country and faith in self which have made her tragic struggle so heroic.

The history of Lithuania is a history of moral dedication to right, to spiritual principles, to liberty and true freedom of body and spirit. These professions of faith in the future overflow her borders and flood the world.

Russia will never extinguish the idealism of this great little nation, nor her right to be free. As long as America stands as the bulwark of national independence, Lithuania's cause will be our cause and her faith now and forever will remain our sacred trust.

We salute Lithuania on this 43d anniversary of her independence.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let February 16, 1961, the day of the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, pass by without paying my tribute, and that of the people of North Dakota whom I represent, to a wonderful and courageous people. These Lithuanian people have refused to buckle down under Russia's communistic yoke. They have fought dauntlessly and bravely for their freedom.

This state, which is the largest and most highly populated of the three Baltic States, first achieved independence in the 11th century, A.D. In 1775, when Russia and Prussia were partitioned, it lost its independence. This Russian domination carried through for 120 years. Every generation had its fighters who rose up in arms against this tyrannical rule, and these brave people finally attained independence in 1918, after suffering great losses. The people worked heroically to become economically independent, and to put its government on a stable basis. Had it not been for the intervention of World War II, and the Red army which terrorized their countryside, these people would have succeeded in putting their house in order. Russia took this country over under the guise of holding fixed Communist elections, which were invalid in any court of human justice.

Russia has this country tightly under their thumb, but the fight is not over. It will not be over until once again these hardy people become self-governing. As long as freedom reigns in their hearts and minds, let us encourage, at least morally if nothing else, their fight to restore their country's freedom. This country has a God-given right to enjoy liberty and freedom, and should certainly have the free exercise of this right. The committee of Lithuanians and their friends formed for the celebration of the 43d anniversary puts it very aptly when they say:

If Khrushchev is sincere in his statement calling for the abolishment of all colonialism, let him manifest it by freeing Lithuania and the other nations now under his rule.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, in my district, where we have as fellow citizens many Americans of Lithuanian descent, the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, has a meaning that is perhaps more real than it is in some other parts, where the people have had less opportunity to know the virtues and the attractive traits of the Lithuanian people and something about their homeland.

It is a disgrace in a world where Soviet Russia talks peace and plays the part of the big bully, that Lithuania is a captive nation, since June 1940, when by subversion and by force ruthlessly "integrated" a nation of 3 million people in the Soviet Union and continues to brazen out the fiction that the Baltic country is a Republic in that Union.

The rulers of the Kremlin, the architects of Communist imperialism, would have the free world believe that the people of Lithuania voluntarily chose communism. But the free world knows very well that the Communist elections which took place there were invalid and that it was by brute force and force alone that Lithuania was subjugated to the tyrannical rule of Russia.

The United States of America, believing as always that the captive nations, as we said concerning ourselves in our own Declaration of Independence "are and of right ought to be free," continues to refuse to recognize, de facto or de jure, the illegal and cruel annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union.

Here in the House of Representatives, where for as many years as I have been a Member, it has been the custom for many Members to commemorate the anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we are moved today to reaffirm, as strongly as it is possible for us to do so, that Lithuania, like all other captive nations, wants independence with political and social justice.

Lithuania wants the free exercise of her God-given right to enjoy liberty and freedom. If Khrushchev is sincere in his call for the end of colonialism everywhere, it is his move that is called for now, to free Lithuania and the other Soviet colonial nations.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I wish to join the many Members of the House in paying tribute to the 43d anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence which occurred on February 16, 1918. Lithuania is a small country and certainly its lack of size has encouraged the Soviets in their ruthless disregard for the human rights of the brave Lithuanian people. These Lithuanian people, by the way, are scattered throughout the vast Soviet slave empire and those still in their native land are under an extremely harsh Soviet yoke. We are all aware also of the fact that the two other Baltic countries, Estonia and Latvia, share the same fate as their Lithuanian neighbors.

As we pay tribute to the heroic Lithuanian people, it is our obligation to re-emphasize that the future must once again provide them with true freedom and independence. This freedom and independence is rightfully the heritage of the Lithuanian and all other peoples now held captive beyond the Iron Curtain in the vast bloody Soviet empire.

There is no point this afternoon to repeat the tragic history of the Yalta Conference which doomed these brave peoples to modern slavery. It is to the future we look with hope that the free nations of the world, led by the United States, do recognize the true nature of the Communist empire and will never be lured by the transparent dogma of peaceful coexistence to adopt a policy of appeasing the Reds whose one desire is world conquest.

Lithuania will someday in the future be free. Certainly a brave Christian nation which has suffered terrible oppression under the Soviets in the last 21 years will once again receive its rightful position among the free nations of the world.

I am honored in joining my colleagues this afternoon in reiterating our constant interest and firm conviction to wage a relentless struggle against worldwide communism and eventually restore true freedom to Lithuania and all the other captive nations.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the 43d anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania, I am privileged to join with so many of my colleagues in a tribute to the gallant people of this historic country. I yield to no one in my admiration for the people of Lithuania and their courageous struggle for freedom.

In my district there are many Americans of Lithuanian descent and I count

many of them as warm, personal friends, and associates. You will find them in all walks of life—lawyers, factory workers, doctors, merchants, businessmen, and women of all types—a sturdy, self-reliant race in whose hearts burns the flame of dedication to the highest ideals of true democracy. Their contributions to my home city and district in fields of industry, politics, science, and culture have been, and continue to be, among the finest of any group in our area.

No one can look at the desperate situation which prevails in their native land without a deep sense of outrage and shame. Ground between the upper and nether millstones of Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia, thousands of Lithuanian families have been broken up and members deported under the most revolting conditions and assigned to slave labor in coal mines and forests. Completely subjugated by the ruthless hordes from the East, no words of mine could adequately describe the harshness of this tyranny. Countless hundreds have died at the hands of their conquerors while those who may have survived this brutality have only prospects of a living death.

Encouragement and hope for their eventual freedom is fanned each year in these memorial addresses—encouragement and hope born of the fact that the flickering lamp of freedom still burns in little Lithuania. The people seek only the restoration of law and morality, their hopes based on the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations. They look to the United States for encouragement and aid. At the moment, we can give only encouragement—the kind of encouragement our forefathers in this great land looked for in their fight for independence nearly 200 years ago. May the day soon come when something more tangible can be done to make their dreams come to reality.

Let us all hope, pray, and work for the end of their temporary enslavement. Let us by word and deed do everything within our power to restore freedom to the people of Lithuania—freedom from the oppressing yoke of imperialist domination. Let no rash promises of early assistance be made these great people, but let them know that we are on their side—as we know God is also. We know that He moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform. Let us hope and pray that His wonder of deliverance may be close at hand.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is a special privilege to pay tribute to the freedom-loving Lithuanians throughout the world, who on February 16, 1961, will observe the 43d anniversary of their national independence.

Since the late 18th century, the Lithuanians have enjoyed freedom and independence for only a brief period. Only during the years between the two World Wars were they allowed to live in happiness in their historic homeland. After having endured the oppressive rule of Russian autocracy for more than a full century, they regained their freedom and established the Lithuanian Republic on February 16, 1918.

At the end of the First World War the Lithuanians were aided by friends and

sympathizers abroad in their effort to put their ravaged country in order. They pulled themselves together and succeeded in making Lithuania a prosperous and progressive country. They were justly proud of their accomplishments and were happy. But the turn of international events was to cause endless unhappiness to them.

Lithuania was one of the early victims of the last war. By mid-1940 the country was occupied by the Red army and had become part of the Soviet Union. Since those unhappy days its misery and misfortune have multiplied. However, although there seems to be no end to their misfortune, the Lithuanian people still cherish their memories of liberty.

Today, when the Lithuanian people suffer under Soviet tyranny more than did their fathers under czarist autocracy, they have our wholehearted sympathy. We are one in echoing their genuine sentiments for freedom and independence on the 43d anniversary celebration of their independence day.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people are among the most stalwart and brave fighters for freedom and independence. But freedom and independence have been denied to them for centuries. Except for the brief period of the interwar years, for almost two centuries they have had the misfortune to suffer under an oppressive and at times almost unbearable alien yoke in their homeland. Then toward the end of the First World War they saw their chance for freedom, seized upon it, and on February 16, 1918, proclaimed their independence.

That historic day marked a new day for the Lithuanian people. It ushered in a new era for them, one full of joy and happiness. Thenceforth they joined hands and worked cheerfully in the tasks of rebuilding their devastated country, reestablishing democratic institutions there, and safeguarding their newly won freedom. In all these difficult tasks they made great progress, and they were both proud and happy with their achievements. For two decades they enjoyed the fruits of their labor in freedom.

Then came the last war. That war swept away all the achievements of the Lithuanians and robbed them of their freedom. Their country was made part of the Soviet Union in 1940, and they became unwilling servants of that monolithic empire.

At the end of the war the Lithuanian people were denied their freedom. Instead, the chain of Communist totalitarian dictatorship was tightened over them. Today they are prisoners behind the Iron Curtain. There they work under the watchful eye of their taskmasters and pray for the end of their misery and servitude. We in the free world join them in their prayer for freedom on the 43d anniversary celebration of their independence day.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, 43 years ago on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people proclaimed their independence from Russia and established a Republic. This was the end of a long struggle that began several centuries ago and lasted throughout all the years the little country was besieged by greedy

tyrants of Europe who bartered her back and forth among themselves for their own selfish ends. However, the joys of freedom and independence were short lived in the new Republic. Now she is a captive nation once again, subject to the infamy of Soviet imperialism. But despite the hardships, privations, and indescribable misery inflicted on her people, their spirit and hopes have remained strong and steadfast. We see these qualities today in those who have settled here. It is this spirit that has made them such patriotic citizens of their adopted country, dedicated to the principles of democracy we follow and enjoy, but too often fail to appreciate.

The free people of the world are bound together in a desire to release those citizens of Lithuania who are forcibly held in bondage by the Russian regime. Let us renew our pledge of friendship and support expressed in the captive nations' resolution passed by the Congress a year ago. As we observe this solemn occasion of Lithuania's independence, may we let those people who are again enslaved know that we are constantly concerned for their plight and may we pray for their liberation.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on this date 43 years ago, the proud and sovereign little nation of Lithuania proclaimed its independence. Because of the tragic events 20 years ago, this is a day of solemn commemoration and tribute rather than one of joyful celebration. Our thoughts continue to be solemn as we contemplate the fate of this once-free nation. We commemorate and pay tribute to the courage and determination of the Lithuanian people who have been enslaved against their will—a will which is determined to maintain the spirit of liberty despite the most heinous of police state mechanisms dedicated to its extirpation.

Among the nations of our time, Lithuania's existence was short lived. In 1940 without any cause or provocation the Communist giant invaded and, as a national entity on the maps of the world, Lithuania ceased to exist. Such an act of rapacity and barbarism by the Soviets bespeaks their true intentions toward free peoples and reveals their designs for the world. Indeed, events since that early date have proved again and again beyond a doubt that communism and its peace overtures is, and always will be, the antithesis of freedom.

It is well for us to recall the plight of Lithuania lest time make us forget. What happened to this little nation can and may happen again to other states, unless we maintain the true image of communism which such examples constantly recall in our minds.

The Lithuanian people have spent over 20 years in Soviet bondage. Because of clearly defined differences to Russia, in their history, culture, religion, and language, their brutal masters have had to employ a special type of fiendish suppression to eradicate the deep roots of a people which go back over a thousand years. Yet, there are strong indications that despite a ceaseless campaign, calculated in its ferocity, the people of Lithuania have continued to maintain their national identity. Most

important of all, they have retained their hopes and aspirations for eventual freedom, against odds too great to compute. This is again a positive example that communism may enslave the body, but that when it is faced by a determined people who firmly believe in liberty, it cannot enslave nor capture the mind.

So today, we pay tribute to the people of Lithuania, enslaved though they are, because we admire their fortitude and their ideals—ideals which are the same for free men everywhere. Let us hope that the future will bring a fruition of their burning desire to be rightfully free and independent. To the end that the entire captive world be again free, let us rededicate ourselves. To the brave people of Lithuania, to those Americans of Lithuanian extraction, we hold forth the pledge that this nation and others who are enslaved have not been forgotten and that this Government of free men stands ready to assist and defend the cause of freedom and liberty.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today is the 43d anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It was an independence that was destined to be short lived, due to the oppressive Russian Communist invasion in 1940.

The Lithuanian people have a strong belief in freedom, and their hopes remain high for the liberation of their country from the iron rule imposed by the Red leaders of the Kremlin.

Their spirit of resistance is not broken, and I pray it shall never be broken. We all look forward with the people of this Baltic nation to the day when they will be free again.

I do not know when this day will come, but it is inevitable that it will come. Never in history has a people been subjugated forever. The people of Lithuania will again have freedom and a new independence day.

Let those of us in the free world constantly remind Premier Khrushchev that he must set his own house in order before he talks of liberation of colonies in other parts of the world. Let us constantly remind the world of the Russian "colonies," the nations such as Lithuania which are ruled by Russian military force and made a temporary part of the Soviet Union.

Let us remind the boastful Khrushchev of the tens of thousands of Lithuanians shipped from their homes in cattle cars and never heard from again. Let us pay tribute to these people who died as slaves to the Russian Communists.

And finally, let us join with the Lithuanian people in this country and elsewhere in the free world of this independence day and look always forward to the eventual freedom of Lithuania.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, a prominent constituent of mine wrote to me recently and called my attention to the fact that today marks the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the Republic of Lithuania.

In his letter, he summarized in a very pointed way the importance of this commemoration. He wrote:

This 43d anniversary is an occasion of deep significance to all who hope Lithuania will again be free and independent—the

cause of Lithuania is the cause of all captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain who have not surrendered their desire for freedom and liberty to the tyranny of communism.

It is most appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress of the United States take time out today to commemorate this occasion formally and to reassert our dedication to the historic American policy of encouraging freedom and independence and opportunity for nations and peoples throughout the world. This purpose is the cornerstone of American foreign policy, and when we speak today to the freedom-loving people of Lithuania, wherever they may be, we speak to and for freedom-loving people everywhere.

As we commemorate Lithuanian independence, we must never forget how the people of that small but noble nation lost their independence. Twenty years of freedom came to an end on August 23, 1939, when Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany signed their infamous pact of friendship and nonaggression, a pact which freed Hitler to attack the West and which—by virtue of a secret protocol to the agreement—placed Lithuania and her sister Baltic States in the Soviet Russian sphere of influence.

On June 15, 1940, the Soviet armies invaded Lithuania. Since that time the world has been forced to watch one of the most horrible examples of ethnic genocide and forced colonialism in history. In the most coldblooded possible fashion, Soviet invaders set about systematically to liquidate the Lithuanian social and cultural elite, to destroy the Roman Catholic Church and the faith of the Lithuanian people, and forcibly to colonize Lithuania by means of mass immigration of peoples from within the Soviet Union.

In the 20 years from 1939 to 1959 it is conservatively estimated that 1,239,000 Lithuanians were forcibly deported, repatriated, or otherwise liquidated by Nazi and Soviet forces. Among them were about 240,000 Lithuanian Jews who perished in Nazi concentration camps during World War II and about 750,000 ethnic Lithuanians who were wiped out as a result of Soviet terrorism and genocide. This figure is based on Soviet census statistics and represents about 25 percent of what the population of ethnic Lithuanians should have been in 1959, estimated on a conservative basis of a 1-percent annual natural increase of population.

This tremendous loss of Lithuania's population through Nazi and Soviet genocide provided Russia with an excuse to colonize Lithuania with Russians. Whereas in 1940 the Russian population of the country amounted to only 65,000—most of whom were unsympathetic to communism—the Soviets subsequently brought into Lithuania about 214,000 well-indoctrinated Soviet citizens in order to exercise effective control over every detail of the political, cultural, and economic life of the country.

The pattern of forcible incorporation of whole countries into the Soviet Union since 1939, including Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia,

subjugated 22 million people in 6 countries. In addition, the Soviet Union has exercised economic, political, and military domination over many millions of men and women in other neighboring countries. Together, this ugly record of human oppression constitutes the most terrible example of brutal colonialism in the modern history of mankind.

Yet, as the example of Lithuania demonstrates—to the extent we are able to document it—the people of Eastern Europe are still courageously resisting the pressures of Soviet domination, bravely asserting their individuality, outspokenly defending their religion. To be a Christian today in Lithuania is to invite martyrdom, yet hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians are daily accepting that risk. Evidence reported in both the American and Soviet press prove impressively that the people of Lithuania have relentlessly held on to their traditional love of freedom, have determinedly defended their faith, and have resolutely retained their sense of identity as free Lithuanians.

On this occasion, therefore, let the Congress of the United States send its greetings to the oppressed people of Lithuania, and assure them they have not been forgotten. Let us renew our determination never to recognize the Soviet domination of Lithuania. And let us proclaim once more to the world our country's heritage of freedom and our people's support of freedom and independence for everyone, everywhere.

Under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the Record, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the text of resolutions unanimously adopted by the Lithuanian Americans of Linden, N.J., in commemoration of the 43d anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence:

Whereas on February 16, 1918, 43 years ago, the Republic of Lithuania was declared a free and independent state by the Council of Lithuania in Vilnius; and

Whereas in commemoration of this 43d anniversary, Americans of Lithuanian descent rededicate themselves to the cause of Lithuania's independence, which in 1940 was brutally invaded by the Communist government of Soviet Russia in violation of its treaty obligations, imposing to date upon the people of Lithuania a most ruthless regime of Communist dictatorship and colonialism and reducing the people to the status of colonial slaves; and

Whereas the anticolonialist resolution introduced by the Soviet Union delegation to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations proposing complete independence and freedom to all colonial countries, to which resolution the American delegation submitted an amendment urging to expand the meaning of said Soviet resolution to include the colonial countries held by the Soviet Russia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting express gratitude to the U.S. Government for the consistently demonstrated favorable attitude toward Lithuania's independence and that the representatives of our Government firmly maintain this policy at any future deliberations regarding the status of the enslaved nations; and

Resolved, That the Soviet policy of national genocide and unmerciful exploitation of Lithuania and her people be condemned; and

Resolved, It be demanded that the Soviet Union withdraw from the territory of Lithuania and that the people of Lithuania be allowed to elect their government in conformity with their freely expressed will and desire; and

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency John F. Kennedy; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk; to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Adlai Stevenson; to the U.S. Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable Clifford P. Case and the Honorable Harrison A. Williams; to the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable Florence P. Dwyer; and to the Governor of the State of New Jersey, the Honorable Robert B. Meyner.

JOHN LIUDVINAITIS,
President.
V. TURSA,
Secretary.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 12, it was my pleasure to participate, along with the Lithuanian-American community of my home city of Rochester, N.Y., in the celebration of the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian independence. I should like to insert at this point in the Record the brief remarks which I made on this occasion:

I am so happy that I am able to join you today in celebrating the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian independence. It took a bit of doing as the weather and the Capital Airlines conspired against me, but I made an especial effort as I have had such bad luck in attending several of your functions. I have enjoyed so much the personal contacts with so many of your members, that I wanted particularly to be with you today.

These are hazardous and dangerous days in which we live. But then, many of you and your countrymen are not strangers to danger and hardship. For centuries you have heard the sounds of the conquerors' boots marching across your land with the ultimate rape of your freedom and independence in 1940 when Lithuania was virtually yanked behind the Iron Curtain. But despite the use of every device known to man to destroy the passion for freedom, the deep-rooted national consciousness, and the religious fervor of the people of Lithuania, the love of God, of country, and of liberty continues to burn as brightly as ever.

Many times, I feel that those of us whose roots have been buried deep in this country for many years do not appreciate our freedoms as do you who have known from personal experience or that of your loved ones just what it means not to enjoy—as a matter of course—the privileges and satisfactions of living in a free society.

A new element has entered the international picture in these past months which must make your indignation and frustration more complete. And that is the sanctimonious and hypocritical attack by the Communist complex on what they chose to call Western imperialism while they practice colonialism of the worst sort in the virtual enslavement of the peoples of Eastern Europe and bend every effort by propaganda and infiltration to add to their colonial empire the newly emerging nations of Africa.

The responsibilities of the West are very clear and most urgent. We must continue our efforts to let the peoples not only of Lithuania—but of Albania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, and Rumania—know that we have not forgotten them, that we are their friends and that their ultimate freedom is one of our most important goals.

We have a new administration in Washington and it is devoutly to be hoped that it is one that will remain strong and firm in the face of the constant Communist threat and not one that will tend toward accommodation and compromise. It is very true that the world cannot continue indefinitely with two colossi dividing the world. But, in finding a solution to this power struggle there are certain principles from which we cannot retreat. And turning our backs on our friends is one of them.

I can assure you that the Congress will continue its support of your cause as expressed in the solemn resolution in 1959 on Captive Nations Week. We shall work and pray for the liberation of your homeland with the hope that the unquenchable spark of liberty burning in your hearts will one day soon burst into a high, clear flame.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the heartfelt struggle goes on—yet the people prodded by strong religious precepts and undying love for liberty persevere against the common enemy, Communists.

This is the 43d anniversary of Lithuania's independence. Even the Iron Curtain has not destroyed the furor of the Lithuanian spirit to overcome their aggressors. Lithuanians will fight for liberty until it is won. Its noble people will ultimately throw off the Soviet yoke. The prayers and heartfelt devotion of their compatriots in the United States will give the stimulation, spirit, and fortitude to continue the struggle until final victory is theirs.

In spirit Lithuania is much alive and today her hearts, with the beseeching eyes of her subjects, look up to Heaven in this great day of prayer. This bravery, cultured in the struggle of their great tradition of freedom, dating before the Christian era, steeled to tolerance and suffering, in sincere prayer, kneeling before her religious altars, look to the day ending Soviet slavery, tyranny, and domination.

The great problem today confronting the United States is, what can we do to liberate these small nations, throughout Europe and the Baltic area, who are now enslaved under the Russian power? How can we, with these nations in enslavement, consider our liberty secure, while countries like Lithuania suffer inhuman bondage? Certainly the continuous use of pugnacious words will not be the solution and certainly not wishes and prayers alone will free these faithful patriots, who patiently wait for the day of liberation. Certainly education of the enemy will not secure their freedom. It is written in the blood of nations that rescue from enslavement by forceful repudiation will only come through internal eruption and revolt against their despotic control by the tyrants of our time.

If violence be necessary, then, in that event, our Government must stand by these captured nations, who have struggled for freedoms as we honor them. Lithuania must be free and we must further every endeavor toward the realization of this freedom. We can only protect our freedom by protecting and recovering for freedom-loving nations their freedoms.

If we are a strong nation with a gun in one hand and a Bible in the other, no one will dare oppose our right to

defend a righteous cause. With God and preparedness on our side and the great leadership of the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy—being dominant in his desire for uncontested supremacy in preparedness, to settle any dispute at the conference table or otherwise—we cannot fail doing something about gaining Lithuania her independence. It is God's will that it shall so be.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday millions of men and women—some existing under the surveillance of their Communist masters, others entombed in Soviet prisons and slave labor camps—held silent observance of the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

These Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain remembered, too, that February 16 marked the 708th anniversary of the founding of their proud kingdom, in 1253.

For them it was a grim celebration, but hope, like a candle, flickers in their hearts. More than 20 years under the heel of Communist despotism have not extinguished that flame.

I was proud to join the effort to free these enslaved people when I yesterday introduced House Concurrent Resolution 163, which calls upon the President of the United States to ask the United Nations to request that the U.S.S.R., first, withdraw all troops from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; second, to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, slave labor camps, and prisons, and, finally, to conduct free elections in the Baltic countries.

In doing so, it is my prayerful hope that it will play some part in fulfilling the objectives of my good American-Lithuanian friends who have written me as follows:

COMMITTEE FOR THE CELEBRATION
OF THE 43D ANNIVERSARY OF LITHU-
ANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY,
Worcester, Mass., February 4, 1961.

Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: February 16, 1961, the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, once again reminds us that Lithuania is not free. Since June 1940 when the Soviet regime was ruthlessly imposed upon her, Lithuania has been a captive nation under Russia. The Soviets would have the free world believe that Lithuania voluntarily chose communism, but the free world knows very well that the Communist elections which took place there were invalid and that it was the brute force of the Soviet military which subjugated the country to the tyrannical rule of Russia.

We, American-Lithuanians, are deeply gratified that our Government, never for once abandoning the principle of freedom for all captive nations, continues to refuse to recognize de jure the invalid and unjust annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet. For this our Government will ever merit our sincerest and profoundest gratitude.

The coming anniversary moves us to reaffirm, as strongly as it is possible for us to do so, that Lithuania, like all other captive nations, wants national independence with political and social justice. She wants the free exercise of her God-given right to enjoy liberty and freedom. If Khrushchev is sincere in his statement calling for the abolishment of all colonialism, let him manifest it by freeing Lithuania and the other nations now under his rule.

May we on this occasion ask you to use the influence of your high position in aiding the

just cause of Lithuania. Your efforts joined with ours will, we pray God, bring about the restoration of Lithuania's freedom and will do much to prevent the mastery of the entire human race by Soviet communism.

Thanking you for your invaluable cooperation, we remain,

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH W. GLAVICKAS,
Chairman.
MARY T. KLIMKASITIS,
Secretary.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues today in commemorating the 43d anniversary of the restoration of independence to Lithuania. While 20 years have passed since their brave nation was swallowed up behind the Iron Curtain, we can know that the spirit of liberty lives on in the hearts of her indomitable people.

Lithuania achieved the status of an independent democratic republic on February 16, 1918. Subsequently, Russia signed an agreement with Lithuania, renouncing forever all claims to sovereignty over her, and Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations in 1921.

During their 22 years of independence, the Lithuanian people made significant contributions to the political and cultural life of Western Europe. Land reforms were instituted, industrial growth was fostered, and guarantees extended to the freedoms of speech, assembly, and religion.

The infamous nonaggression pact between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany opened the way for Lithuania's occupation by the Germans, giving way to the Communists when the Russians began their offensive in 1944. Despite solemn treaty assurances to "renounce all rights of sovereignty in the Baltic States," the Soviet Union proceeded to incorporate Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. The U.S. Government has consistently refused to recognize de jure this annexation, and deplores the continued suppression of human rights in Lithuania.

On this 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence, it is appropriate that the Congress should honor a valiant people. Even in the face of Communist tyranny, their resolute faith in Almighty God has never wavered. With freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, we lift our hearts in prayer that independence may soon again be restored to Lithuania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, soon after the overthrow of the detested czarist regime in Russia during the First World War, many oppressed nationalities asserted their freedom and proclaimed their political independence. The three Baltic peoples which had been held under Russian autocracy for more than 100 years did this early in 1918. The Lithuanians proclaimed their independence on February 16 and founded the Lithuanian Republic.

For about two decades these freedom-hungry people enjoyed their richly deserved independence. They rebuilt their war-ravaged country, strengthened their democratic institutions, revived their venerated national traditions, and were content with the progressive course in which things were moving. But the outbreak of the Second World War put a stop to all this and brought tragedy to

the Lithuanians. Lithuania was invaded and occupied by the Red army in 1940, and its inhabitants completely sealed off behind the Soviet borders.

Since then unhappy Lithuanians have not known freedom. Today the country is ruled by the Communist totalitarian dictatorship imposed by the Kremlin. There people are compelled to work for the omnipotent state, and are not free to leave the country under any circumstances. In a word, they are imprisoned in their homeland, and pray for their deliverance. On this 43d anniversary celebration of their independence day I devoutly hope that they will have a quick response to their earnest prayer.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, before World War II a Lithuanian-American went back to his native land for a brief visit. It had been many years since he had left; he had been only a small boy. He visited Kaunas and Panevezys and his own small village. There he met many people, all of whom were very interested in him because he came from America. They all had friends and relatives in America whom they asked after. Among them he met a woman who showed him a picture of her business and her sons. She ran a food store of some size. She said, we do not need to go to America. Our America is right here. We prosper and are happy.

I doubt that Lithuanian villagers are as contented or prosperous today as they were then. Following World War II and Nazi occupation, Lithuanian independence was replaced by Communist domination. That villager can no longer say that Lithuania is her America. No longer is she able to participate in private enterprise, to work hard and reap the benefits of her work. No longer is it possible for her to elect the people she wants to run her government and her society. No longer is it possible for her to lead the kind of life she desires away from the watchful eye of the governing power.

Today we cannot go to war over Lithuania, but we can support her exiled people and do all in our power to make Lithuanians both here and in their own country as prosperous and happy as possible. Perhaps with prayer and determination Lithuania will once again be free. The activity and interest of Lithuanian national groups throughout the world is most helpful. By telling of the oppressive Communist measures and keeping the knowledge of the fate of that little country always before us, we are only that much more aware of the results of oppression and that much more moved to keep alive the spirit of independence and self-determination in the world today.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for obtaining this time today to celebrate the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. I am pleased to join with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to the spirit of freedom held in the hearts of Lithuanian people everywhere.

The history of the Lithuanian people is an unusual story of heroism and suffering and of man's constant efforts to

assert his God-given human rights. After suffering under the autocratic czarist regime of Russia for over 100 years, Lithuanians regained their freedom toward the end of the First World War, and proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918. For two decades they lived and enjoyed their life in happiness. In that relatively short time, they rebuilt their ravaged country, set up their own democratic form of government, and reestablished many of the old Lithuanian customs and traditional institutions.

Storm clouds appeared in 1939 and cast a menacing shadow over Lithuania which proved fatal to the freedom of the people of this brave country. Early in 1940, the Kremlin imposed upon the helpless Lithuanians a so-called mutual assistance pact and later that same year the country was occupied by Soviet troops and incorporated into the Soviet Union. Since then these brave people have been enduring dictatorial tyrannies of totalitarian regimes, both Nazi and Communist version. For years they have endured indescribable hardships and despite such despairing conditions these stouthearted people have not given up their hope to secure freedom.

I feel we should join with them on this historic day and with Americans of Lithuanian descent express our fervent hope that the cause of freedom and independence will soon prevail.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, recent and current international events have brought in their train tragic consequences. The last World War has, instead of freeing oppressed peoples, actually caused the eradication of freedom in many lands, and has extended the reign of terror over many former free countries, thus depriving tens of millions of peoples of their freedom and independence. Three million Lithuanians were among these peoples.

These stalwart and stouthearted people who had regained their independence in the First World War, were one of the first victims of the last war. After regaining freedom in 1918, and after enjoying it for a brief period of two decades, they were robbed of it by the Communist Russians. While democratic Lithuania was enjoying freedom Communist bosses of the Kremlin were jealous of Lithuania's democratic "luxury," freedom, and independence. Soon after the outbreak of the last war, while the democracies of the West were involved in a life-and-death struggle, the Red army conquered Lithuania and put an end to the Lithuanian Republic. Soon the country became part of the Soviet Union, and its helpless inhabitants mere slaves in Communist labor camps. During the course of the war their condition grew from bad to worse, but at least they had the hope of earning their freedom at the end of that war. Then when the end came they found that there was no freedom for them. The war thus proved to be their national tragedy.

Today these unfortunate people, brave and stouthearted as ever, still cling to their ideals of freedom and independence. I am glad to join loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent in the celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day and

with them hope for the freedom of the Lithuanian people in their homeland.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, Lithuanians were living under Russian autocracy. That had been their lot for more than a century. During all that time they wanted to regain their freedom, and to that end they organized revolts and uprisings against the czarist regime, but all these attempts failed because Russia was always able to overpower the Lithuanians. In 1917 the decrepit czarist regime crumbled, and then the Lithuanians had their chance. They naturally seized upon it, proclaimed their independence, and established the Lithuanian Republic.

In the course of the next two decades the Republic grew in strength and democratic institutions under it served the Lithuanians well. The result was that in the relatively short time, during the interwar years, Lithuania became a prosperous and progressive country. Lithuanians were happy and enjoying their freedom to the full. Then came the Second World War. First they became apprehensive of their involvement, and even of their safety. Unfortunately their worst fears proved justified. In 1940 Stalin's Red army invaded and occupied the country, put an end to the Lithuanian Republic and thus robbed the Lithuanian people of their freedom. Soon the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and since then freedom and independence, joy, and happiness have been banished from Lithuania. Instead today we find there these stanch and freedom-hungry 3 million yearning and praying for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny. Let us hope that they will soon have their reward in freedom and live in peace in their homeland.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, when the Lithuanian people asserted their independence from Imperial Russia, they cast off the yoke of over a century of adversity. But this dearly won freedom was not to last. In 1939, Lithuania was subjected to the terrors of Communist domination when Soviet Russia, without provocation, seized the country by force. The proud Lithuanian people continue to suffer terrible oppressions at the hands of the godless Communist dictators. They share the fate of millions in the captive European nations.

And so it is with a mixed feeling of sadness and of pride that we gather 43 years after the restoration of independence on that day in 1918 to pay tribute to that memorable event and to the Lithuanian people the world over who have fought so gallantly in behalf of freedom, and in whom the flame of liberty still burns brightly.

We recall the heroism of the Lithuanian people and their courageous determination to keep uppermost in their hearts and minds their goal of national independence. Lithuania has indeed set a lasting example of strength and courage for the free world.

I am proud to join with my colleagues and with freedom-loving persons everywhere in reaffirming our dedication to the cause of Lithuanian independence.

We salute the Lithuanian people, whose spirits remain unbroken, and we pray that we will one day be able to observe this anniversary with the knowledge that Lithuania has once again taken its place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in March 1917 the tyrannical czarist regime in Russia was overthrown by the people of Russia and the 123-year-old rule of the czars over Lithuania was ended. Shortly thereafter, on February 16, 1917, the Lithuanians proclaimed their independence and established a democratic republic.

The year 1917, however, brought to the Lithuanians not only the fulfillment of their dreams of freedom, but also the seeds of the destruction of this freedom. The Bolsheviks in Russia, after subverting the democratic revolution of March to their own ends, seized the reins of government and proclaimed Russia a Communist state.

For the next 20 years the Communists, beset by internal strife, consolidated their rule within the Soviet Union. With the advent of the Second World War, however, they saw the opportunity to take advantage of the chaotic international situation and extend their influence beyond the borders of Russia. Thus, the Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939 declared Lithuania within the Soviet sphere of influence and Red army troops invaded the country. Then, on July 21, 1940, the Lithuanian Republic was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and the brief span of freedom for the Lithuanians was ended.

On this the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence I join all Americans and freedom-loving people throughout the world in thoughts of sympathy and hope for the hapless people of that small country. We can only stand fast in our adherence to the principles of liberty and democracy and, continuing the battle against the Communist dictatorship, await the day when all people everywhere will be free.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, all of us must experience sorrow that liberty, no matter how strong its partisans, has often suffered at the hands of tyranny. The Lithuanian people have suffered greatly since that day two decades ago when the forces of communism marched in to snuff out forces opposed to them, and to wipe out a staunch republic.

The record of what happened was documented some years back by a select committee of this House. In company with her sister republics, Lithuania was subjected to mass deportations and genocide as the Soviet Union ruthlessly moved to stamp out the spark of resistance. Despite the harsh methods employed, that effort has not been totally successful, as we know from evidence that seeps through the Iron Curtain.

Meanwhile, the spirit of Lithuanian independence has been kept staunchly alive in America by descendants of that brave people. They have worked hard, and their work, mindful of the hardships their forebears were undergoing, has inspired others to recognize the cruel as-

pects of the fate of the Lithuanian Republic.

Lithuania, like all captive republics, wants the free exercise of the right to enjoy liberty and freedom. Lithuania wants national independence with political and social justice. The free world ought to keep constantly fresh the reminder that Khrushchev can make a solid demonstration of his disbelief in colonialism at any time by freeing the states which the Soviet Union keeps under its colonial yoke.

Not long ago, the Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania reported that the 20 years of indoctrination to which Lithuanian youth has been subjected is producing a generation which disbelieves in what it is being forced to learn. We know that the so-called superior Soviet education is creating difficulties for the Soviet Government, by permitting them a level of education at which it is natural to doubt how superior that system is. The same effect which has been voted in the Soviet Union is abroad in Lithuania.

The bright flame of Lithuanian independence is being kept alive, and the future will bring justice. We in the United States can help by pledging again our eternal faith in the principle of freedom for all captive nations.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, today, February 17, we celebrate the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. It should indeed be a day of great joy to all Lithuanians, but, because of the shroud of the Iron Curtain, this day is celebrated throughout the world with emotions of joy and sorrow—joy in remembering the independence won 43 years ago by the freedom-loving people of Lithuania, and sorrow in remembering these great people who on June 15, 1940, lost that independence to the Soviet Union and had their lives darkened by the Iron Curtain.

We must, in celebrating this day, again rededicate ourselves fervently to the task of raising the Iron Curtain so that the sunshine of freedom can once again shine on them and the world again enjoy with them their wonderful culture and achievements.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the advent of Lithuanian Independence Day this month serves to remind us of the fate of that little but valiant country that has been under Communist domination for most of the last two decades. Particularly, as we see many peoples elsewhere in the world finally realize their national aspirations and begin to build self-sufficient countries of their own will, it is painful to be reminded that Lithuania, as well as many other Eastern European countries, is not independent. We celebrate this anniversary, however, in the hope that in the near future Lithuania will once again be able to select its own form of government and control its own national destiny. We celebrate in the remembrance that for 20 years, between 1918 and 1940, Lithuania knew the contentment of free government. To deprive people that have once known freedom is perhaps more cruel than domination of people

that have never known anything but that. To these people I extend my sincerest sympathy and understanding. Yet it is not good to live only in the reflection of that past liberty without facing the present situation. Rather let us take courage and strengthen our resolve to work toward the future freedom of Lithuania in this celebration of its former independence.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that freedom-loving people should pause and pay homage to Lithuanians on this anniversary of their independence. Lithuania enjoyed independence from 1918 until 1940 and in that short period of time held a notable and respected place among the free nations.

When we consider the fate of many millions of people behind the Iron Curtain, it seems almost intolerable that so many have been deprived of the freedom to govern themselves. Today as we celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day, we are again reminded of the struggles of the Lithuanian people to assert themselves as an independent state. They are a courageous and spirited people, who deserve better than domination and tyrannical government at the hands of the Russians.

As Americans opposed to all forms of such flagrant enslavement, we will never approve of the present Lithuanian Government. We will always believe that the rightful government must be formed at the will of the Lithuanian people. I am glad today to be among my colleagues in the House of Representatives as we join our Americans of Lithuanian descent in echoing their patriot sentiments and renewing their faith and hope that Lithuania again will be a free and independent country.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, when the First World War sounded the death knell for autocracies in Russia and in east-central Europe, all oppressed peoples in these lands were overjoyed, for in the overthrow of these autocracies they hoped to find their freedom. When that war brought liberation to a large number of oppressed nationalities, the Lithuanians were among them.

The history of the Lithuanian people goes back to early Middle Ages, but the turbulent period of their modern history started in the 16th century by the union of Lithuania with Poland as a dual kingdom. Late in the 18th century, when Poland lost her independence and became part of czarist Russia, Lithuania also came under the czarist regime. For more than 100 years the Lithuanians suffered under the unrelenting autocracy of Russia. During that period they sacrificed much of their worldly possessions, but they did not lose sight of their common national ideal, the attainment of their national political independence.

In 1917 the decrepit czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, and soon after, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanians proclaimed their independence. They then set up their own democratic form of government, and did well by themselves for two decades. In all walks of life they made significant progress, making their little country a model in that part of the world, content in their freedom.

Then came the rude shock of the last war. It seemed that everything the Lithuanian people had regained, including their independence, was under serious threat. Their worst apprehensions proved true. While Lithuania's friends and sympathizers in the West were preoccupied with the prosecution of that war, the Soviet Union set out to carry out its evil designs against the helpless state. First Soviet forces were stationed in all strategic parts of the country. Then in mid-1940, the Red army overran the country and established a puppet regime there. Soon at the "request" of this regime Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union. That was done on July 21, 1940, and thus vanished the independent Lithuanian Republic.

Since those dark days Lithuanians have been suffering under tyrannies, first under the Communists, then during the war for about 2 years under the Nazis, and then under the Communists again. The second time, late in 1944, the Communists came to stay, and there they have been ever since. They have been ruling over the country with an iron hand, and Lithuania's helpless people are constantly victimized by the ruthless agents of the Kremlin. But neither their suffering nor their oppressors have subdued them spiritually. They still cling to their ideals: freedom and independence. I join all Americans of Lithuanian descent in the celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day, and thus echo the genuine sentiments of their kinsmen in Communist-dominated Lithuania.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fitting that the Members of this House who are well aware of the great contributions and sacrifices of the Lithuanian nation in the cause of liberty and justice pause today on the 43d anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania.

While we pay tribute to the gallant spirit of free Lithuania and to the noble heritage of our citizens of Lithuanian descent who have contributed so much to this country, let us not forget the cruel fate which has come upon and still afflicts this unhappy land under the yoke of tyranny and oppression.

This oppression touches not only Lithuania but encompasses many formerly free lands and many noble peoples who have become the victims of confiscation, aggression, exploitation, and brutal tyranny. On this day commemorating Lithuanian independence, let the American people pledge anew their belief in and determination to fight for international order, honor, and decency while the world ponders the callous brutality and monstrous inequities which communism has perpetrated on free peoples in many parts of the globe.

These crimes have been committed against mankind, against free peoples, against civilization itself to the point that the whole world knows that peace can never be achieved on the basis of aggression and tyranny over helpless peoples. Lasting peace can never be achieved by force, by the denial of

human rights, by the ruthless extermination of free institutions.

Instead, let it be known on this day of Lithuanian independence, which we commemorate here today, the American Congress, reflecting the wishes and sentiments of the American people, reaffirms principles of liberty, justice, freedom, human honor, and decency.

The people of Lithuania have a noble heritage and their struggle for freedom has furnished hope and inspiration to the democratic aspirations of many small nations. The sons and daughters of Lithuania have furnished our own great Nation with an inspiring story of freedom-loving immigrants who came to America seeking opportunity and the chance to grow in the new world.

They came with little earthly possessions to find here in America work, happiness, and the chance to raise their families under privileges which they had never before dreamed. These citizens of humble Lithuanian heritage and their descendants in little time have risen to places of leadership and great influence in the professions, in the public service, in religious and business life, and in all the callings of the American people—so much so that they are today among the most highly respected and best in the country in outstanding contributions to the social, economic, and political institutions of this great land of ours.

Thus, in acknowledging the great contributions of our citizens of Lithuanian origin, let it be known in this House on this day of the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence, that this Nation serves notice to the whole world that we stand firm and resolute on the adoption of an affirmative policy to discharge in full measure our obligation to stand by and sustain the Lithuanian people and oppressed peoples everywhere in their hopes for liberation and deliverance from tyranny.

Long live free Lithuania and may that great land and inspired peoples soon regain fullest measure the great liberties they cherish.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the case of Lithuania stands as a symbol of the right of every nation, large or small, to be free and independent. It also carries with it a great human story of a heroic people who struggled over the centuries for their independence—a struggle carried on by an entire nation against the Russian despots. The Lithuanian nation, after winning its independence, demonstrated its real friendship for the United States and its unflinching allegiance to the same free institutions which we so cherish. We Americans have always been proud of the support we gave to the Lithuanian nation in its struggle against the Russians and in building their democratic way of life which characterized Lithuania during the period between the Great Wars.

There is an unbreakable bond between the United States and Lithuania which has been solidly forged upon the anvil of time and experience.

All men of good will are saddened by the plight of Lithuania today, as it stands occupied by the Russian despots. Lithuania has an alien government im-

posed by the Kremlin which has proclaimed its bitter enmity for the United States and our free way of life, but the Lithuanian people have kept faith with us in their determined adherence to the cause of human freedom—despite the terrible penalties they must continue to pay for that position.

Lithuania, like the other non-Russian nations occupied by the Kremlin, sees in the United States the last great hope for civilization. We as a Nation stand as a bright symbol to the certainty that Lithuania will once again be free and independent.

There are strange voices in the world today calling for a recognition of the status quo, a deal with the Russians whereby Russia would keep intact its vast empire of slavery in exchange for which we would be spared the Russian hatchet for a few fleeting, humiliating years.

The modern day Russian czar, Khrushchev, stated that the only problems to be negotiated between the Russians and the free world was acceptance of a status quo. He stated in unmistakable words that unless the United States and our allies are prepared to accept this first condition, negotiation of such other problems as there might be would not be considered by the Russians. In other words, Khrushchev told the world that the Russians were prepared to grant a temporary peace if the free world would recognize the present-day Russian Empire and undertake a nonaggression pact which would announce to the world that all the people behind the Iron Curtain were doomed to everlasting slavery.

There is greater need today than ever before in our history for the American people to be vigilant in the defense of our individual liberties and the advocacy of the right of every nation to be free and independent. We know that the best guarantee for our own liberty and safety is a world in which every nation is free and all empires are dissolved.

On this 43d anniversary of Lithuanian national independence, I urge that the foreign policy of the United States be brought under critical review by the American people. In this respect the Congress of the United States can and will perform its part.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as liberty-loving Americans, we here in the Congress of the United States take note that though today marks the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania, that hapless country is not free but is still one of the captive nations under Communist Russia.

The world will always remember with horror the year 1940 when the Soviets invaded peaceful Lithuania, suppressed its freedom, liquidated its national independence, and incorporated its territory within the Soviet Union. This brutal seizure of the country, the ruthless suppression of religious, human, and political rights, and the very vicious policies practiced against the people by the Communists, cry out as crimes against humanity. Our hearts are deeply touched by the plight in which the people of Lithuania find themselves.

It is a remarkable coincidence that between the birthdays of America's two outstanding national heroes, Abraham Lincoln and George Washington, brave Lithuania declared its independence and celebrated its own birthday as a nation. Forty-three years ago, we of the United States welcomed with joy and satisfaction the attainment of independence by Lithuania, for we treasure and value freedom and liberty. These Lithuanians who came and settled in America have enriched our country and have contributed immeasurably to its culture and we, therefore, appreciate the sterling qualities of these fine men and women. We unite with them and with other Americans who have relatives in Lithuania in the fervent hope that all peoples in the captive countries will once again know freedom.

As a Member of the Congress of the United States and as a human being, I shall always support the proper and legitimate aims and worthy desires of the Lithuanian people that their native land shall have an early liberation from their cruel taskmasters and that, in the end, right, justice, and equity shall prevail.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of Lithuanian independence I am proud to be one of those Americans commemorating this day in hopes that Lithuanian independence will soon be the reality that so many have fought, died, and lived for.

The significance of Lithuania to those of us of Western culture is this: From a glorious and ancient past in which the Duchy of Lithuania stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea the Lithuanian people have again and again been bled by richer and more powerful neighbors. From 1385 until the end of the 18th century Lithuania was part of Poland; then when Poland was annexed by czarist Russia in 1795 Lithuania shared the same fate. Finally, in 1918, taking dual advantage of President Wilson's 14 points and the Russian revolution, the Lithuanian people declared their independence. This was their first taste of freedom since the 14th century; it lasted 22 years. In June 1940 Soviet troops took over the country. Then almost immediately the land was overrun by the German Army. German occupation lasted from 1941 until 1944, when it was displaced once again by the death grip of the Russian Bear.

I give this thumbnail sketch of the woes of Lithuania not to prove that history can be cruel but, rather, to point a meaningful moral. The Lithuanian people have been relentlessly submerged by force. They are now the unwilling victims of a political religion that seeks converts by every means known. The people of Lithuania in their present political dilemma represent the very thing that America fights against in word and in deed the world over. As such, we honor the people of Lithuania and their friends, relatives, and countrymen that live in the United States as men who have upheld the tenets of Western political culture. These men and women believe in the highest ideals of freedom, justice, and right. They have

not been corrupted by Russian words but have seen and felt the sword of social and political tyranny beneath the phrases.

We in the United States have never known the haunting fear of having our independence physically threatened, let alone the reality of foreign occupation. We can speak of the plight and the bravery of the Lithuanian people, but for most of us we understand their plight only through our imagination. But, nevertheless, here are people—almost 3 million people—that are realistic symbols of man's inhumanity to his fellow man.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, 43 years ago, the people of Lithuania proclaimed their national independence in their historic homeland and instituted their own democratic Republic. It was a momentous day for the Lithuanians as they embarked on a new course in their history. A new beginning which would erase the memory of a past that had been dominated by the oppressive rule of the czars.

In the course of just two decades, the people worked hard and accomplished near miracles. The war-ravaged country was rebuilt and the democratic regime took root. But it was at this moment that another event occurred over which they had no control. The clouds of the Second World War had begun to form and, unfortunately, the threat became a full-fledged storm which surpassed the Lithuanians' fears and forebodings.

Stalin's forces invaded and occupied the country and in July of 1940 Lithuania was annexed to the Soviet Union, thus marking an end to the Lithuanian Republic that had been born on February 16, 1918.

Today the national ideals of freedom, liberty, and independence that the Lithuanians cherished so deeply are virtually nonexistent in their country. An area so completely under the control of Moscow can never fully realize these aims. In order to have real meaning, they must be exercised in an atmosphere free from the threat of reprisal or suppression. Lithuania as a part of the Soviet Union constitutionally is an equal partner, but in reality Moscow maintains a tight control on all aspects of Lithuanian life—social, political, and educational.

Needless to say the people themselves have not forgotten the original ideals that led to their 1918 proclamation. On this anniversary of their independence, if not permitted to do so publicly, at least within their hearts they again renew their allegiance to a free Lithuania. We in turn join with them in celebrating this day and applaud the valor and unconquerable spirit of a people who have and will continue to strive for complete freedom, liberty, and independence.

Mr. GLAIMO. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. It is customary for the House to join with our Lithuanian friends around the world in commemorating this date. It is most fitting that we do so for this day should be remembered by all peoples who enjoy the blessings of liberty. February 16 should re-

mind all of us of the courage of the Lithuanian people who have valiantly sought freedom through decades of cruel oppression.

The courageous struggle of the Lithuanian people to secure freedom and independence spans centuries. Four hundred years before the discovery of America, Lithuania succeeded in establishing an independent and free state. Then in the late 18th century, the Lithuanian people were forcefully absorbed into the old Russian Empire. Suffering under the heel of the czarist domination for the next 123 years, these brave people succeeded in transmitting from generation to generation their love of liberty and their tradition and ideal of national freedom. Forty-three years ago today they won and proclaimed their independence and were welcomed into the community of free nations.

Lithuania enjoyed her precious prize of freedom, but a short while before it was once again forcefully snatched away at the point of a foreign bayonet. In 1940, the Soviet Union dispatched the Red army into this small nation. Since then the Kremlin has deliberately set out to stamp out Lithuanian culture and to exterminate the spirit of independence. They continue to this day to terrorize the Lithuanian people by oppression, persecution, and mass deportation.

We in America are moved with compassion by the suffering our Lithuanian friends have borne over the years. Anniversaries are, for most of us joyous occasions which call for celebration. But to the people of Lithuania there is little cause for joy. They must commemorate this day in mute if defiant silence. Rather than a moment of celebration today is for them a time of solemn reconsecration to an ideal of freedom which continues to live in the hearts and minds of a people long enslaved.

We who are more fortunate can take inspiration from the fact that through long periods of bondage the Lithuanian people have unwaveringly maintained the spirit of freedom and the ideal of national independence. We are confident that in this tragic hour of their national life, these brave people will not fail in their fidelity to the noble traditions and determined faith which have always sustained the human spirit in the midst of misery and tragedy. We to whom history has been more benign are steadfast in the hope and prayer that the human birthright of individual liberty and national self-determination will be restored to the Lithuanian people. And we are confident in the hope that the suffering of yesterday's and today's generation will assume meaning through the lives of a generation blessed with a liberty made possible by decades of faith in freedom and justice.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, today Estonians the world over are commemorating the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Estonia.

However, since World War II, this wonderful little Baltic country, with individual culture and a fervent love of independence, has been incorporated into the Soviet colonial empire.

Estonia, whose heritage dates back to 3300 B.C., had struggled for years and successfully established its complete independence on February 24, 1918.

As of that date, Estonia had gained national independence and freedom. But it was short lived. With World War II, Estonia again was placed under totalitarian tyranny when it was forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union.

Despite the continued efforts of the Soviet Union to destroy Estonia as a national entity, the Estonians have not ceased fighting for the right of independence.

There can be no doubt that the Soviet Union has inflicted the full force of brutality on Estonia to achieve its goal. Mass deportation of population, the transfer of large groups to remote sections of the Soviet Union as forced labor plus individual persecutions still have not dimmed the flame of liberty in the hearts of Estonians.

This anniversary must be a symbol for all of us to continue our fight to have Estonia, and the other countries enslaved by the Soviet Union, free and independent once again.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in commemoration of Lithuanian independence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MISSING—ONE ARMY DIVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, an entire Army division is missing from the Nation's defense complex. This is a key division and an integral part of the free world's defense program. This is the Army's 15th Division—lost when the strength of the Army was reduced from 900,000 to 870,000 men. Because of the lack of a 15th Division, a serious weakness exists. It reduces the effectiveness of America's military posture and reduces our ability to speedily and capably reinforce our allies. It should be replaced and the strength of the Army should be increased. Ask any Army man. He can give you the cold, hard facts.

No one can predict with certainty how the United States may be called upon to use its military power. Our land, sea, and air forces may well be engaged in a spectrum of nonnuclear operations, from a small-scale expedition, through multiple actions, to a large-scale war. They may be required to fight in one or more limited nuclear engagements or they may even find themselves in the holocaust of a general nuclear war. For the United States, particularly as a member of a collective security system, these potential uses of military power generate many obligations. It requires that a large quantity of our forces be constantly stationed overseas; it inevitably influences our selection of courses of action

in war; and it means that we must be ready to fight alongside allied forces, who will often need considerable support from the United States in the form of troops, logistics, and military know-how. In areas such as the Middle East and in southeast Asia, where few if any U.S. bases exist, the problem of support is extremely complicated and requires an unusual capability in the U.S. forces which might be employed there to be able to engage in sustained combat.

Under the current situation that has evolved in which both the United States and the U.S.S.R. maintain comparable strategic nuclear attack forces, neither having the capability of destroying enough of the other's nuclear strike to prevent receiving unacceptable damage, the result may well be that the long-range nuclear capabilities of the United States and the U.S.S.R. will in effect counterbalance each other. It already is the stated policy of the United States to use nuclear weapons only in retaliation. This philosophy and its consequent supporting military structure is based on the assumption that the Soviets would initiate nuclear war. However, if the Soviets elect not to start a nuclear war, and reject the use of nuclear weapons—an equally logical and probable choice, to say the least—the position of the United States and the free world in other existing elements of military power vis-a-vis the Soviets is not favorable.

Thus, the problem becomes one in which the operative element of military power is now integrated land, sea, and air forces capable of conducting military operations with or without nuclear weapons, but as nuclear capabilities become balanced there is necessity for placing increasing reliance on nonnuclear weapons to halt or defeat aggressions short of nuclear war.

This places renewed emphasis on numbers of men; an emphasis particularly felt by the land forces, which alone can control the land masses of the world and the people who inhabit them. With an adequate number of men, there of course must be the most modern weapons and equipment available in order to exploit to the fullest the dual nuclear or nonnuclear capability of the Army forces. Yet these modern weapons and the new equipment do not replace manpower. This is a fact which unfortunately is seldom understood. The requirement for men in numbers exists irrespective of the marvels of machinery. In fact, complicated and highly technical weapons and equipment require for operation and maintenance more rather than fewer men.

In light of the framework just mentioned, the Congress and the executive branch are faced with complex and difficult decisions on how the Nation's resources can best be allocated to its defense. The Army has the same problem. Its size and resources have been contracted, while the requirements which national security and the emerging condition of nuclear parity place upon it have increased.

The fundamental role of the Army, as the Nation's land force, is to defeat en-

emy forces in land combat and to gain control of the land and its people. The Army is organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations on land. Within these roles the basic responsibilities of the U.S. Army are:

First. To maintain forces in readiness. This involves the development and maintenance in the United States and overseas of continually modernized operating forces, including combat and supporting components, together with the continental base necessary to sustain and when required, to reinforce these forces. These forces include elements for land combat and for continental air defense.

Second. To provide for expansion of the Army upon mobilization. This involves the maintenance of readily mobilizable reserve components, and the mobilization base, comprising training and logistic elements, for their support. These forces must be prepared to reinforce active Army forces in conditions short of war and in limited and general war. Today, with the disappearance of the advantage of time and space offered the United States in the past, this capability assumes even greater importance.

Third. To provide support to allied, national, defense establishments and interservice activities in furtherance of national policies and objectives.

This involves a large segment of the Army which as a result is not available to the Army for all practicable purposes for assignment to units of its forces in combat readiness. These include personnel performing tasks supporting the United Nations, allied nations, U.S. Government agencies, joint military tasks, activities of other U.S. armed services, and other types of functions. The Army is called upon to perform these tasks because of its capabilities and assigned functions. Performance of these tasks contribute substantially to the total U.S. defense effort.

The concept of land combat includes: The development and maintenance in the United States and overseas of modernized balanced field forces both combat and support elements.

Forces capable of combat in conjunction with air and sea forces and the armed forces of our allies over extended distances and possibly for extended periods of time.

The administration and logistic support necessary to sustain these forces under any commitment.

Within this concept, U.S. Army land forces must be ready for any mission, anywhere, anytime. The current U.S. Army forces are constituted and deployed worldwide with definitive vital roles to carry out in each case. For example:

EUROPE

The U.S. Army forces in Europe constitute the major segment of strength of the ground element of the NATO shield forces. This forward shield of a five division force must be capable of dealing with a wide range of situations. In general war it will immediately enter into sustained land combat in defense of Western Europe. This force continues

to be tangible evidence of the U.S. ability to execute its commitments to the security and freedom of the people of Western Europe. These forces are also required to be prepared for limited war situations, including operations in contiguous areas. For the magnitude of the task facing NATO forces, five U.S. divisions even with other allied forces are marginally adequate. In fact, greater ground force strength is an urgent requirement for NATO.

PACIFIC

U.S. Army forces in the Pacific, in conjunction with other U.S. forces, maintain U.S. interests in the Pacific Ocean, the Asian littoral, and the mainland of Asia. These forces support U.S. commitments in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—and the Anzus Pact, and with Korea, Japan, the Philippines, and Taiwan.

In Korea, U.S. Army forces include two infantry divisions, artillery and missile units, and provide tangible evidence of U.S. determination to meet its commitments to the U.N. Here again is a marginal situation which in the event of an emergency will require an increase in U.S. Army strength.

In Hawaii, there is an infantry division with one of its airborne battle groups on Okinawa, prepared for use at any point from Korea around the 4,000-mile arc to southeast Asia. Other Army combat and support forces are in Okinawa and Japan to support U.S. Army, Marine Corps, and allied forces in land combat in the Pacific area.

Army forces in the Pacific are performed maintained at austere levels in relation to assigned responsibilities. Thus, in the event of hostilities, they must rely upon immediate reinforcement from the United States.

ALASKA AND CARIBBEAN

U.S. Army forces are also deployed in the Western Hemisphere. In both the Caribbean and Alaska we have a "two battle group force" and air defense elements. Additional tasks of these Army forces include operation of the Cold Weather and Mountain School in Alaska, the Jungle Warfare Training Center in Panama, and the maintenance of facilities and stocks for deployment as required of additional Army forces from the strategic reserve, and of course, such contingency plans that pertain to their geographical areas.

Not mentioned in the tasks and responsibilities of the above worldwide deployed U.S. Army forces is their inestimable contribution to our nonmilitary cold war program. By their presence, their posture in being, a definitive contribution to stabilization, law, and order is effected amongst our allies. Their effect on the Communists has been that since World War II there has been on armed Communist aggression initiated within range of U.S. Army weapons other than in Korea.

STRATEGIC RESERVE

The U.S. Army forces in the Continental United States are, as you know, known as the strategic reserve. The Army's strategic reserve backs our cold war efforts in those countries where we

maintain no permanent forces. This force can inhibit violence from a distance particularly if its capabilities are kept fresh in friendly, neutral, and enemy minds through joint training exercises. It must be prepared and capable of quick deployment to one or even more than one location simultaneously. This six-division strategic army force—Strac—is divided into two components.

First. One component is the strategic army corps, commonly referred to as Strac, which is an austere, currently three-division force immediately ready for deployment in either limited or general war. This force is designed to reinforce rapidly the already deployed U.S. Army forces in fulfilling NATO, SEATO, CENTO, and as well as for employment to other commitments. Currently, this force includes one infantry division, two airborne divisions, and other combat and combat supporting units.

Second. The remainder of the strategic army force consists of two infantry divisions, one armored division, and other combat and combat supporting units. These elements of Strac are at present used for training of recruits and as a source of personnel with appropriate combat skills to support overseas rotation in peacetime and as a base for deployment shortly after mobilization.

The Army is fully aware of the need to provide that combination of combat and support units which insures the most effective forces in readiness to meet assigned responsibilities and for this reason and in the framework of the responsibilities herein outlined has constantly strived to maintain a 15-division balanced Army force structure. It is impossible to do the job properly with fewer than 15. Notwithstanding, in the spring of 1959, the Army was forced because of decreasing budgetary and personnel authorizations to reduce Strac from a four-division force to a three-division force. Currently, the U.S. Army stands with eight divisions deployed overseas, supported by six divisions in continental United States, of which but three divisions are immediately capable of instantaneous deployment for reinforcement overseas or for direct employment in other contingency operations.

It has become increasingly evident in the light of recent and current international situations, that definite requirement exists to restore Strac to its previous four-division status. The expansive commitment of our already deployed overseas forces, and their austere quantity preclude their removal for any appropriate period of time, for other contingencies that may occur without the ability for their quick replacement "in the line" by equivalent elements from the only available source, Strac. Thus the U.S. Army, with its austere organization and large commitments, is constantly faced with a "rob Peter to pay Paul" situation. This situation is felt to be beyond the acceptable risk status as pertains to the national security of the United States and the free world. The rapid response of an airborne division, using strategic airlift, can do much to bolster a deteriorating situation. This airborne division in many situations

would be followed and relieved by an infantry division. Under the present Strac organization, when two simultaneous military situations occur in wide-spread areas, the two airborne divisions could respond. However, one of these airborne divisions could not be reinforced or relieved by an infantry division. The capability to respond to a subsequent crisis would be expended. This inflexibility should not be tolerated under current and foreseeable world conditions. The addition of one infantry division to Strac to supplement the current two airborne and one infantry divisions would reconstitute a force that could place the United States in a far, far better position to respond to varying types of military situations.

Increasing awareness has been given to the probability of simultaneous involvement of our forces in more than one geographical location of the world. The U.S. Army with Strac consisting as it does of but a three-division force, would be hard pressed to cover such situations. The recoupment of the 4th Division in Strac would put the United States in a generally acceptable position to respond to more than one contingency operation, should such occur simultaneously. Another benefit which would be derived from an additional infantry division, by returning the previously removed division to the Army in Conus, is badly needed augmentation of the Conus training base which supports the eight divisions deployed overseas.

Mr. Speaker, there are many problems which confront us in the military arena. The first and foremost is for the United States to be able to respond to the entire spectrum of the military threat. We can help toward solving this problem by returning the Army the strength it needs to add a minimum of another division—its 15th division. That means increasing the strength of the Army to a minimum of 900,000 men. With this additional force, the Army would be far better fitted to respond to the many crises which face us today in the world.

J. EDWARD ROUSH ELECTED IN FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, INDIANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include two articles from the Indianapolis Times and an affidavit from the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana has been without representation during the 87th session of Congress.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives has not received a legal certificate based on the official vote returns to seat a Member of Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana.

Two purported certificates of election were issued to George O. Chambers. The first of these alleged certificates of election was illegal and spurious because it was signed by the Governor 7 days after the election held on November 8, 1960. The Indiana statutes specifically provides that 10 days must intervene after the election for the county clerks to correct possible errors in the voting before the results can be certified to the secretary of state by the county clerks.

For some mysterious reason, the former Governor, Harold Handley, issued this unlawful certificate to the Republican candidate, George O. Chambers, in the Fifth Congressional District before the statutory vote-correction period had elapsed. Also, for some mysterious reason, other Congressmen elected in the State of Indiana did not receive a certification of the election until several weeks after the 10-day statutory period had elapsed. In other words, the unlawful first certification of election issued to George O. Chambers was in brazen violation of law and as phony as a \$3 bill.

CONGRESSIONAL HEARING

On December 16, the Congressional Committee on Elections under Congressman CLIFFORD DAVIS as chairman held hearings in Washington, D.C., on the congressional elections contest in the Fifth District of Indiana. At this hearing a transcript signed by the Honorable Charles O. Hendricks, secretary of state of Indiana, was recorded as part of the testimony. This transcript set out the official vote of all the 10 counties in the Indiana Fifth Congressional District. This official vote and transcript is now on record in the office of Ralph Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, and also part of the record of the above-named congressional committee.

The Indiana secretary of state's transcript officially recorded the vote for J. Edward Roush as 106,874, and George O. Chambers as 106,872.

The only official record of total votes for Congress recorded in the office of Indiana's secretary of state and also in the Clerk of the House of Representatives records J. Edward Roush as elected by a majority of two votes.

SECOND ALLEGED CERTIFICATE

Evidently the Republic leadership in Indiana realized that the alleged first certificate of the Governor was illegal because within 24 hours before the convening of Congress on January 3 they dispatched another certificate of election for George O. Chambers to Washington, D.C. This alleged certificate was sent by "moonlight" and arrived at the Clerk's office a few hours before Congress convened at 12 noon on January 3, 1961. This second certificate is prima facie illegal and not based on recorded vote results. It unlawfully disregards the certification transcript of the Indiana secretary of state, Hon. Charles O. Hendricks, on file in the Clerk's office and also with the House Elections Committee. That transcript sets out the official vote from the 10 counties, county clerks in the fifth Congressional District of Indiana. It records J. Edward Roush

was elected over George O. Chambers by a majority of two votes.

Almost 7 weeks have passed since the 87th Congress convened. The Fifth District of Indiana should have representation in the National House of Representatives. I respectfully ask the chairman of the House Administration Committee to immediately hold hearings and review the official vote recorded and on file in the office of the Indiana secretary of state, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and the testimony and decision of the House Congressional Committee on Elections. The records of these three governmental units, without any remote question of doubt reveal that J. Edward Roush was elected to the House of Representatives by a majority of two votes.

J. Edward Roush should immediately be seated after the House Administration Committee has examined the official recorded vote from the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point the affidavit of Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, setting out the official vote by county for U.S. Representatives in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana, which when added up gave J. Edward Roush a majority of two votes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(The affidavit referred to follows:)

I, Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct excerpt from the certificate of the Honorable Charles O. Hendricks, secretary of state of the State of Indiana, as submitted under his signature and the seal of that State, December 7, 1960, to the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, U.S. House of Representatives, pursuant to the request of said committee, the original of which certificate is in the files of the U.S. House of Representatives:

"Copies, as amended, of certified statement of the clerks of the circuit courts of the following counties: Miami, Wabash, Huntington, Grant, Howard, Tipton, Clinton, Madison, Blackford, and Jay, of the general election held on November 8, 1960. I further certify that the above-named counties comprise the Fifth Indiana Congressional District, as the same appears on file, as the law directs, in this office."

I further certify that these certificates reflect the following vote by counties:

County:	J. Edward Roush	George O. Chambers
Miami	7,297	7,568
Wabash	6,991	9,050
Huntington	10,386	7,505
Grant	15,652	17,027
Howard	16,335	14,752
Tipton	3,998	4,283
Clinton	7,565	8,554
Madison	30,156	29,231
Blackford	3,620	3,311
Jay	5,774	5,591
Totals	106,874	106,872

In witness whereof I hereunto affix my name and the seal of the House of Representatives, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, this 13th day of December, anno Domini, 1960.

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

INDIANAPOLIS TIMES INVESTIGATION

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Indianapolis Times for the great service the newspaper is rendering in exposing fraud in the Republican election machinery in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana. To quote the Indianapolis Times, a Republican newspaper, in an article Sunday, February 5, 1961, relating to the casting of absentee ballots in Anderson, Ind.:

Veteran Republican State Election Commissioner Edwin M. S. Steer said he never heard of anything like it, "it opens the way to fraud."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a news story by Ted Knap on the front page of the Sunday, February 5, 1961, Indianapolis Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

PROBE 45 ABSENTEE BALLOTS TO ONE GOP WORKER—SUSPECTED VOTES CAN MAKE ED ROUSH CONGRESSMAN IN FIFTH

(By Ted Knap)

Forty-five absentee election ballots were mailed to the home of a Republican precinct committeeman in Anderson, the Indianapolis Times learned last night.

The FBI has been notified and has reported to the Justice Department in Washington.

Veteran Republican State Election Commissioner Edwin M. S. Steers said he never heard of anything like it, and said "it opens the way to fraud."

If fraud is found, it virtually would guarantee the election of Democrat J. Edward Roush as the Fifth District Congressman.

The congressional seat at present is vacant because the Chambers-Roush election is in dispute. A congressional committee in Washington, trying to determine who won the election, is checking into it.

Republican George Chambers, Anderson, claims he won the November 8 election by 12 votes. Democrat Roush, Huntington, claims victory by two votes.

On voting machines, Anderson's precinct 4 of ward 3 went to Roush, 595 to 310.

On the absentee ballots, that precinct went to Chambers 41 to 21.

Of the 71 absentee ballots requested from that precinct, 45 were mailed to 809 West 14th, home of Mr. and Mrs. Harold Doyle.

They are the only registered voters living there. Doyle is Republican precinct committeeman and she is vice committeeman. At the time Doyle was the GOP-appointed watchman at the State highway garage in Anderson.

Doyle said he did it that way to "protect the voters" and "keep the Democrats from stealing it."

Doyle said he (or his wife) went to the 45 voters, most of them Negroes, and had them sign applications for absentee ballots.

"They were sick or working at jobs that wouldn't give them time to go to the polls," he explained.

The absentee voter application says "Mail to (address)." Instead of having them mailed to the voter, Doyle had his own address filled in.

County Clerk Eugene Creagmile, a Democrat, said the clerk who mailed the ballots thought nothing of it because she figured 809 West 14th was a nursing home.

When Doyle got the blank ballots, he said he or his wife took them to the voters, waited for them to be filled out, then notarized the sealed envelopes in which he said they were placed. The Doyles mailed about half the

ballots, while others were mailed by the voters, he said.

Steers at first said it was illegal. In rechecking the State election law—much of which he authored—he determined it was a legal loophole. The law says the absentee ballot shall be mailed to the address named in the application.

"But it's not proper," Steers declared. "He could vote every one of them." Steers added that the "whole absentee ballot system is so full of crookedness that it ought to be repealed."

"Neither my wife or I filled any ballot," Doyle told the Times.

Amos Jackson, Democratic committeeman in that precinct, said he checked with one of the 45 voters. "He told me he did not fill out a ballot or sign anything," Jackson said.

One of the 45 votes was rejected at the poll because Jackson found it was purportedly cast by a man committed to an insane asylum in another city. Insane persons are disqualified from voting.

Two others were rejected, but 42 of the 45 absentee ballots handled by the Doyles were counted.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to incorporate a story by Ted Knap on Sunday, February 12, 1961, in the Indianapolis Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

HERE'S PROOF OF ELECTION VIOLATIONS—FIND ILLEGAL VOTES AMONG 45 MAILED TO GOP WORKER

(By Ted Knap)

The 45 absentee ballots mailed to a Republican precinct committeeman in Anderson are riddled with election law violations, investigation by the Times showed today. Some of the absentee voters were exploited and deceived.

Some said they did not fill out the ballots cast in their name.

At least one signature was falsely notarized by a GOP committeewoman.

Records indicate one woman voted twice, without knowing it.

At least 10 separate sections of the election law appear to have been violated, and sometimes several per ballot.

Official investigation of those 45 ballots was undertaken by Madison County Prosecutor Melvin Thornburg after the Times uncovered them last Sunday.

It may decide the disputed Fifth District congressional election. Republican George Chambers claims victory by 12 votes and Democrat J. Edward Roush by 2.

The investigation centers around Mr. and Mrs. Harold Doyle, the Republican committeeman and committeewoman of Anderson's precinct 4 of ward 3. They had the 45 ballots mailed to their home, 809 West 14th.

Most of the 45 absentee voters are Negroes. Many are uneducated. Some can't read or write.

On voting machines, Roush won that precinct about 2 to 1. On absentee ballots, he lost about 2 to 1.

Fourteen of those absentee voters were interviewed this week by the Times. Their stories indicated these violations:

The Doyles solicited them to vote absentee. The voters didn't know the blank ballots would be mailed to the Doyles.

They voted absentee even though able to go to the polls.

Doctor's certificates were obtained without examination.

The Doyles saw for whom some voted.

In some instances, the Doyles pointed to where the voter's "x" mark should go.

Mrs. Doyle herself filled out some ballots.

Marked ballots were handed to the Doyles, not placed in envelopes and sealed.

Voters did not sign sealed envelopes, as required by law.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. DENTON. I want to congratulate my colleague from Indiana for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. The fact remains that the election certificate from the secretary of state of Indiana to the Clerk of the House of Representatives indicating the official vote showed that Mr. Roush won by a majority of two votes. Two other certificates were issued, but as the gentleman from Indiana pointed out, one of them was issued prematurely—why, I do not know; and the other was issued within 24 hours of the time the House of Representatives convened.

As I remember, they met on a holiday, drew up the certificate and sent it down here by airmail. Why that was done I do not know. But the fact does remain that a committee of the House of Representatives investigated this matter and they, like the record in the office of the secretary of state and the record in the office of the Clerk of the House, show that Roush won by a majority of two votes.

On the evidence I think Mr. Roush should be seated and Chambers be left to contest the election. However, the Committee on Elections of the House of Representatives recommended that neither man be seated, and that the votes be rechecked. I think that was extremely fair. In the meantime, I, like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] hope the House Committee on Administration will conduct a speedy recount of the vote, and if that is done that Roush will be seated.

I also want to commend the Indianapolis Times and my good friend Ted Knap for the investigation they made showing fraud on the part of the election officials in one of the counties in the Fifth District. I think they have rendered a great service to the people of Indiana and to the Nation in bringing this to public attention.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. I do not wish to interfere in the affairs of another State but I do want to say that I think a determination should be made as rapidly as possible so that the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana will not be denied the representation to which they are entitled here in this House of Representatives. I think justice demands that someone be seated.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] for his remarks, also the gentleman from Florida for his remarks. I entirely agree that the Fifth District should have immediate representation on the floor of this House. Considering the hocus-pocus that has been carried on through the secretary of state or the Governor's office in issuing two illegal, spurious certificates in face of the official recorded returns, I firmly believe it is within the

jurisdiction of the House Committee on Administration to meet and review the official vote from Indiana and to seat J. Edward Roush as a Member of the House.

OUR DYNAMIC ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 30, 1961, President Kennedy delivered a state of the Union address to the Congress. On Thursday, February 2, 1961, he sent to the Congress a message entitled "Program for Economic Recovery and Growth."

Both messages were shocking in their disregard for honest scholarship in the field of economics. There is plenty of room for a disagreement between the two political parties on the proposals necessary to move our country forward in meeting the problems we face in our times. However, there should be no room for unfair and unscholarly presentations of the issues. Such a course will bring the minimum response from those Members of Congress and the people who are already unsympathetic to many of Mr. Kennedy's proposals.

It is a shame that the President saw fit to disregard the temperate and scholarly economic appraisal prepared at his request by Roy Blough, Paul W. McCracken, and Allan Sproul, chairman, submitted January 18, 1961. The following quotations from the report bring our economy into better perspective:

The evidence available to us in January suggests two conclusions as bases for economic policy in the months ahead. First, the current contraction still appears to be in the family of the relatively mild recessions that have characterized the postwar period. It does not yet look like a cumulative, severe recession. Second, we must assume that the decline in business activity has further to run, though the bottom of the recession could turn out to be not very far below the current level of business activity.

Even if the force of the upturn, this time, should turn out to be somewhat less than in these earlier periods, and there is as yet no certainty about this, our output of goods and services by the end of this year should be measurably above that of the final quarter in 1960.

Would this be a good performance for the economy in 1961? In a very real sense, this question must be answered in the affirmative.

The Sproul report sets out no such one-sided statements of alarm about our economy as appear in the President's messages, albeit it poses some problems which face our economy, and with which we must grapple.

Both of the two Presidential messages are rehashes of the unfair presentation of the state of our economy which Mr. Kennedy made throughout his campaign for the Presidency.

Is President Kennedy so unsure of himself that he feels he must falsify the essential strength and goodness of our economy in order to have a ready excuse

if he fails to provide the proper political climate so our society may move forward, as everyone anticipates it will move unless throttled? Or is his purpose to set up a benchmark of poor achievement so he might show remarkable achievement, when nothing more than the anticipated economic growth has come about under his administration? Whichever his purpose may be, it is a poor herald of a new frontier.

This process of downgrading America not only misdirects us in meeting our domestic problems, it undermines American foreign policy which depends upon our friends and enemies understanding the strength of America.

THE GROWTH RATE HAS BEEN 4.8 PERCENT

The President stated:

Our Nation has been falling further and further short of its economic capabilities. In the past 7 years our rate of growth has slowed down disturbingly. In the past 3½ years, the gap between what we can produce and what we do produce has threatened to become chronic.

The President makes the following statement to support these conclusions:

But in recent years the economy has not realized even its present possible growth, from the peak of the business cycle in the second quarter of 1953 to the top of the anemic recovery 7 years later, gross national product grew only at an annual rate of 2.5.

Here are the figures. The gross national product of 1953 was \$365.4 billion, the gross national product for 1960 was \$503.2 billion. The annual rate of increase is 4.6 percent, not 2.5 percent. Furthermore, the first two quarters of 1953 were Korean war periods and 1960 was a year of peace. It should be common knowledge that the rate of economic growth measured in gross national product can be stimulated by war and that it will relapse in peacetime. The Democratic leaders and their political economists have shown a blind spot over a period of years, dangerous to our country, in failing to distinguish between a war and a peacetime economy.

Has the President chosen the second quarter of 1953, the last quarter of war, as the date from which to start measuring to contrast war economy with peacetime economy? The last point of measurement of our economy under a Democrat administration, Mr. Truman's, was 1952; 1953 is an Eisenhower year. So let's take the gross national product for the year 1952, \$347 billion, as a starting point. The first Eisenhower year showed an increase from \$347 billion gross national product to \$365.4 billion gross national product, an increase of 5.3 percent, which betters the other 7 years of the Eisenhower administration, which averages over 4.5 percent annual growth. To compare peace years with peace years we can take the gross national product of 1949, the last year of peace under Mr. Truman, and compare it with the gross national product of 1960, a peacetime year. Gross national product of 1949 was \$258.1 billion—that of 1960 was \$503.2 billion, a rise of \$245.1 billion, or an average of almost 7 percent a year growth.

In 3 years of war under Mr. Truman the gross national product went from

\$258.1 billion—1949—to \$347 billion—1952—a rise of \$88.9 billion or \$29.6 billion a year, a growth rate of almost 10 percent a year.

In 8 years, 7½ years being years of peace, under Mr. Eisenhower the gross national product went from \$347 billion—1952—to \$503.2 billion—1960—a rise of \$156.2 billion, or \$19.5 billion a year, a growth rate of 4.8 percent a year.

There was a slowdown in growth under peacetime conditions, all right, but let us compare Truman's peacetime years to get the matter in balance. Truman had 4 years of peace, 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949. The gross national product was at \$213.6 million in 1945 when World War II ended. In 1949, the gross national product was \$258.1 billion, an increase of \$44.5, or a \$11.0 billion-a-year increase compared to the \$19.5 billion-a-year increase under the peacetime years of Eisenhower, a growth rate of 4.4 percent a year compared to 4.8 percent a year.

Let us see what the World War II growth was compared to the Korean war. The gross national product in 1941, the last year of peace, was \$81.9 billion. In 1945, the last year of the war, it was \$213.7, an increase of \$131.8, or \$32.9 billion a year compared to the \$29.6 billion a year of the Korean war, a 22.3-percent growth rate per year compared to 10 percent per year.

All of this proves only two things. First, war stimulates economic growth measured by the gross national product indicator. Second, peace slows down economic growth as measured by the gross national product indicator.

Surely the Kennedy administration is not suggesting a war to stimulate our economy and, therefore, it should cease playing this dangerous game of comparing economics based upon war with economics based upon peace.

The people who presented to Mr. Kennedy the economic figures used in his message to show a growth rate of only 2.5 percent for the last 7 years of the Eisenhower administration of course have adjusted the gross national product figures by what is called the implicit price deflator for total gross national product. In addition to the misrepresentation they engage in by their deliberate disregard of war and peace and the exciting one-quarter from a particular year, 1953, so they could take the most favorable starting point to emphasize this falsification of the true economic picture, they are guilty of using two different methods of measuring without pointing up the significance of the difference.

ECONOMIC GROWTH MEASURED IN GNP VALUABLE ONLY LONG RANGE

It is a very proper process for long-range use of gross national product figures to adjust the gross national product figures for the various years to the most current dollar value, 1959. However, if we apply this same type long-range adjustment to an evaluation of the Truman peace years, 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949, the results will show a minus rate of economic growth. Here are the figures: Gross national product for 1945 in 1959 prices, the takeoff point for Tru-

man's peacetime years, was \$359.9 billion. In 1949, the last peacetime year of the Truman administration, the gross national product was \$328.2 billion, a loss of \$31.7 billion in 4 years, \$8 billion a year—a minus growth rate of 2.5 percent a year. Comparing apples with apples, Truman's peacetime years showed a minus growth rate of 2.5 percent, while Eisenhower's peacetime years showed a plus growth rate of 2.5 percent. However, this kind of exercise is as unfair to the Truman peacetime years as it is to the Eisenhower years. I point all this out in the form of a plea to the honest economists, particularly those who are Democrats, to speak out now and call a halt to this prostitution of their science. This is no small matter, both to the future of our country and to the future of honest scholarship.

Is the Kennedy administration taking over the Lysenko theories of botanical growth and applying them to economic growth? Surely the sad experience of the Russians in their lack of advancement in agriculture and botanical science in recent years is directly attributable to the process of making a science subservient to political theories. We want none of that in America.

AS IN BOTANY

We can get as far behind in economics as in botany if we permit Lysenkoism or Galbraithism to take over.

If the President wants to direct the attention of the people and the Congress to the true economic picture, he should point out that economic growth measured by gross national product is meaningful only for rather lengthy periods of time and that our national average of growth over the past hundred years when we were growing more rapidly and solidly than perhaps any nation in history was around 3 percent or, if computed on a different basis, as some scholars do, about 2.3 percent. Which-ever computation is used, however, the United States annual growth rate during the past 100 years is substantially greater than that of any other nation; and the post-World War II growth rates exceed this long-range average.

Furthermore, as economists have been trying to point out to the people and the Congress for some time, gross national product, though a very valuable series of economic statistics, indeed, one of our most valuable, has serious limitations in measuring true economic growth and this is particularly true for short periods of time—even as short a period as a decade.

Gross national product does not measure economic capacity, but rather, what actually is produced in goods and services in a given year. It includes economic mistakes, that is, unused surpluses, bad planning, poor distribution, faulty production, and so forth, equally with what in the long run proves out to be real economic growth. Much of the growth during periods of war is not real growth or sustainable. Expenditures in capital plant and equipment have a multiplier effect in gross national product while expenditures in research and development and education, which are the most crucial areas for sustained

economic growth, appear relatively small in the gross national product indicator.

We do not need more capacity right now to produce steel or agricultural produce, and yet development in those areas would undoubtedly make a great showing in gross national product. We do need more investment in vocational education, research and development, in general education and basic research, and these expenditures make a relatively poor showing in the gross national product indicator.

Some very fine studies were made by eminent scholars of the limitations of the gross national product indicator in measuring growth in the recent studies conducted by the Joint Economic Committee into Russian economy vis-a-vis the U.S. economy. A study of the limitations of the gross national product indicator as a measure of economic growth brings out forcefully the reason why Germany, Great Britain, France, Japan, Russia, and the Benelux had such great gross national product growth rates in post-World War II years, all of which are tapering off. These countries had one thing in common; they were all industrial nations rebuilding their productive capacities destroyed in the war.

OUR GREATEST YEAR

The Presidential message "Program for Economic Recovery and Growth" is replete with comparative words such as "expand," "growth," "recovery," "higher," "more," without any reference to the base to which perforce these words must relate if they are to have any real meaning. It is understandable only on a narrow partisan basis why President Kennedy chose not to set forth what the Nation's investments in physical and human resources were from which he wants us to expand because these investments are the highest in our history and are testimony to the remarkable dynamism and achievements of our private enterprise system.

It is understandable only on a narrow partisan basis why President Kennedy chose not to emphasize the base from which he would have us grow, \$503 billion gross national product for the year 1960, because this is the highest in our history and the highest in the history of any society at any time.

It is similarly understandable why President Kennedy chose not to relate the base from which he says there was an "anemic recovery" because the base from which it rose was the highest up to that time and war swollen. The recovery, far from being anemic, bettered our longtime average national growth rate, whichever honest measuring stick one cares to use.

It is similarly understandable why he chose not to relate the base from which he says output could have been 8 percent higher than it was in 1960, because again, 1959 was the point of highest output our economy had ever reached. Only 1960 exceeded it, as 1961 should exceed 1960 if the Kennedy axmen do not get to the golden goose.

It is similarly understandable why, when he keeps asking for "more," he does not choose to say "more" than

what, because the amount our Nation and our people have in every area, whether it is in per capita gross national product, number of jobs, take-home pay, national income, purchasing power, homes, electricity, education, leisure time, health facilities, insurance, savings; whether it is quantity or quality, we have set new American records and a new American record in economics is always a new world record.

I want to illustrate this point of calling for more without saying more than what. President Kennedy has said we must spend twice the amount we are spending on education within the next 10 years. Let us look at our expenditure increase in the last 8 years from 1952 to 1960.

In 1952 we spent \$313 per pupil in average daily attendance in public and elementary and secondary schools; in 1958 \$446 per pupil. The figures for 1959 and 1960 not available are even greater. This means that in 1952 about \$8,138 billion was spent for education here compared to about \$15,510 billion in 1959—number of pupils in 1952 was 26 million; in 1959 the number was 33 million. The 1960 figure will be close to \$17 billion.

A request that we double the expenditure in the next 10 years asks for a slowdown in the rate of expenditures in education—not a new frontier we are rushing to at all—a slowdown, all disguised in clever but false semantics by the President and his advisers.

Inaccurate appraisals of our situation can lose what we have, instead of gain that which we wish, and that is exactly what many of the Kennedy administration economic proposals would do. In seeking for the bigger bone we may lose the bone we have, whose reflection in the water has excited us.

THE COST OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

A few things about economic growth should be pointed up. Growing is not easy and the term of growing pains applies to the economy, just as it does to the human body.

First, Rapid technological growth, and that is the economic growth we seek, brings in its wake increased technological unemployment. By the very definition of the process, more skills become obsolete and higher and different kinds of skills are demanded. Need for unskilled and semiskilled labor diminishes. People with no skills or obsolete skills either learn the new skills, and this takes time and money, or they engage in featherbedding or they become unemployed. The more rapid the technological growth, the greater is the incident of frictional unemployment and the greater is the unfilled demand by employers for employees with new and higher skills.

The unemployment that President Kennedy directs attention to is the result essentially of the very growth that he says we want more of. When he states:

More than a million and a half unemployed—over one-third of all unemployed could have had jobs. Twenty billion dollars more personal income could have been earned in 1960.

He is confused about the nature of today's unemployment. The great

body of our unemployed today are unskilled and semiskilled workers, and workers whose skills are obsolete. What jobs would he have them work at in our technologically advanced society—raking leaves or picking cotton? Before they can work usefully, they must be trained. This takes time, money, planning, and organization. Our job is to provide the opportunities for them to become skilled so that they can be useful and so that they can have the dignity that social usefulness brings to all human beings. We do not want to keep them unskilled and we do not want to undermine their desire and incentive to improve themselves to become skilled workers by appealing to their grosser selves by proposing bigger doles. Yet, President Kennedy's proposals are little more than larger doles. This is degrading, not upgrading our people.

Technological advancement—economic growth is good, not bad. Technological growth creates more new jobs than it displaces, but the people must become skilled in order to take on these jobs. That is the reason that in every labor market in the country today, even in the so-called depressed areas, at the same time there is unemployment there are jobs available going unfilled. We talk about needing more teachers, more doctors, more engineers, more nurses, and indeed we do, but the need and demand for skills is hardly limited to the high skills of the professions; it goes right down through the technician rank to all of what we term the skilled labor groups.

The way to grapple with the problem is through vocational education, industrial training, an improved unemployment insurance program which relates itself to the task of retraining. We can get on top of it. Furthermore, we can pay for it out of the increased productivity that technological advancement brings.

But Mr. Kennedy's recommendations are directed to tinkering with our economic successes, real and rapid technological growth, relative price stability, and a rather broad spreading of the wealth, not the failures, technological unemployment, and high costs in the economic growth areas. If we pursue this course, we will make failures out of these successes and by neglect make the damage from the failures worse. I recall Vice President Johnson's address to the jobless who rode to Washington in pullman cars 3 years ago. He said he was going right back to the Senate and put in a resolution to create a committee to go around the country to the depressed areas and come back with proposals for positive action to help them. I suggested that if such a committee were created, it go to the undeveloped areas, not the depressed areas for ideas. I think we should study success, not failure, and apply the lessons we learn from these successes in our attempts to eliminate failures. Fortunately, the economy had recovered before Senator Johnson was able to put what he termed his positive plan for action into effect. Now we have the Secretary of Labor visiting the areas of failure for ideas of success.

Rapid economic growth means increased costs as well as increased frictional or technological employment. Machines as well as skills become obsolete and have to be junked and new ones procured, just as the obsolete skills are no longer used and the cost of training for new skills must be assumed. Rapid and technological growth depends upon moneys expended in research and development. All these expenditures and costs must be recouped in the price the consumer pays for the goods or services if we are to have a sound system. Properly handled, these costs can be recouped in the productivity gains resulting from the innovations.

The Consumer Price Index which is the basic economic statistical series we use to measure price does not take account of increased quality sufficiently to make it a thoroughly reliable series. Furthermore, increased choice or variety of products and services available to the consumer is a basic factor in increased standard of living for our people and increased flexibility and strength in our economy. Increased choice is by no means free; it, too, requires added expenditures which must be recouped in the price of the goods and services charged the consumer. The Consumer Price Index does not reflect the increased economic advantage to the consumer that this flexibility brings. Accordingly, a great deal of what has been referred to loosely as creeping inflation is not inflation at all, but the inadequacy of our economic measuring sticks.

By the same token, much of the implicit price deflation for total gross national product, based as it is to a great degree on the Consumer Price Index, is inaccurate and the growth ratios measured in unadjusted dollars are more real than they have been credited to be.

The productivity gains more than balance the costs of technological advancement. However, these lower costs are frequently hidden in the increased costs that arise from improved quality and increased variety. The consumer as well as the Consumer Price Index tend to ignore this important aspect of increased standard of living and increased strength and flexibility of the overall economy.

RAPID ADVANCEMENT IN AGRICULTURE AND HEALTH

In two major areas in our society, our technological growth has been so rapid that we have created difficult and, in a certain sense, new problems.

The first area I refer to is agriculture. Here the technological advancement has been so great and so rapid that millions of people who had skills of a sort in agriculture find that the skills are now obsolete, are no longer needed. The agricultural work which was rather plentiful 14 years ago and required little and sometimes practically no skill is now being performed by machines. This is success in the field of agriculture, not failure. Commercial agriculture is doing all right. If anything, it might be well if it slowed down a bit so we could get on top of the technological unemployment and cost problems that its very rapid growth has produced. We have a technological unemployment

problem, not an agricultural problem. Until we understand this fact and face up to this cost item of success and take advantage of the released manpower, we are going to continue to slow the progress to all three of our goals.

First, better agriculture; second, better utilization of displaced manpower; and third, an economy assisted instead of hampered by the manner in which we meet goals No. 1 and No. 2.

The second area is in the field of health. So rapid has been our progress in this field that people are living on the average of 10 more years than ever anticipated. Absenteeism from work for health reasons is the lowest in our history. Worker productivity has increased greatly because of good health. Orphanages have closed their doors because parents do not die in epidemics any more. This real advancement in health has produced real costs. Yet, look how the leaders in this new administration approach this problem. By condemning the very professions which have brought this about, by suggesting that the increased costs that this advancement has required are somehow or other not true costs. That the public is being gouged, that the doctors or drug companies are not concerned about spreading the benefit of the advancements in health to all our people. The President's answer to the health problem of the aged, largely created by these recent great advancements, is to undermine the system which has produced the progress. Slowing or eliminating progress certainly will solve the cost of the health problem of the aged, and the rest of us, but not the way any one of us would want it. With no progress, we will not have to pay for the cost of new research and development, the cost of junking obsolete equipment and replacing it with new and better equipment and the cost of eliminating obsolete skills and bringing in and training new skills. We will not even need more doctors, nurses, or hospitals. The skills will remain the same, the equipment will remain the same, the techniques remain the same. The drugs will be the same. We will be stagnant.

CYBERNETICS

Another problem which rapid technological growth has presented to us is just beginning to be evaluated. The new science of cybernetics, the science of thinking machines. Business computers are revolutionizing the science of inventory control. There have been white-collar workers being displaced by these monsters. Let us relax and analyze the problem. There is no question that technological unemployment will be increased somewhat because of machines. Fortunately, as is usually the case in America, the private enterprise system is way ahead of the political government. Retraining programs have been in effect for some time to take the people whose skills are made obsolete by these computing machines and retrain them in new skills that are now needed. The political government could be working with this process, however, rather than by hindering it, as it is presently doing. Good sense suggests that no State in its unemployment com-

pensation program under the Federal-State system should take a person who is technologically unemployed off unemployment compensation when he or she starts to go to school to get retraining in a new skill. Yet five States have statutes which make such backward provisions, and practically none encourage the reverse process. We should amend the unemployment insurance program so that in addition to taking a person off unemployment compensation for failure to accept a job commensurate with his or her skills, that person should also be removed if he fails, if his skill is obsolete or diminishing in demand, to go to school to learn a new skill among the many new ones now in demand because of the very technological advancements which produced the unemployment. I see no reason why the Federal-State unemployment insurance program should not absorb the cost of people with obsolete skills learning new skills either through giving a credit, possibly through a lower experience rating in its unemployment tax, to the industry that undertakes the retraining, or directly to the person who takes the training or to the school that teaches it. This is a proper cost to be borne by business generally. This cost of retraining will be more than recouped by the removal of some of the incentive for featherbedding that fear of technological unemployment creates in the minds of the employee and in the lowering of the number of long-term unemployed persons. The program would require the Department of Labor to do a much more extensive job than it presently is doing in the identification of skills by nomenclature, by geography, and by employer, in keeping the list up to date as technological advancement drops some skills out, alters others, and creates new ones.

DEPRESSED INDUSTRIES IN AN AREA

Furthermore, this is the proper approach to solving what has been called the depressed-area problem. The mistake in approaching the problem is in identifying it as a geographical problem rather than an industry problem. No area is depressed. It is simply an area where an industry important to the area has become depressed. Within the same area other industries are booming. The problem must be tackled on an industry basis, not a geographic basis. I believe that an improved unemployment insurance program along the lines I have suggested would adequately handle the depressed-area problem, although the failure to analyze the problem in the past has permitted the matter to get out of hand in certain spots, so there may be some additional efforts needed on a temporary basis to make up for the past neglect.

The recent or present recession has had as a substantial part of its cause a cutback in inventories. One very definite benefit of the tabulating machines now available is to permit inventories to be kept at more efficient levels. I believe some of the inventory cutbacks reflects this efficiency. This is good in the long run for our economy, but its short-run impact on production has had a slowing down effect. Stable wholesale

and raw material prices over a period of the past few years also have contributed to inventory cutback or keeping inventories at lower levels than during the periods of post-World War II inflation. If this is so, the prospect of more inflation, which the Kennedy programs would encourage if adopted en bloc, is having a countercyclical effect. It is an ill wind that blows no good. I hope this is not taken as encouragement to people to whistle for this ill wind, however.

TAX REFORM TO ENCOURAGE INNOVATION

There is an important area where the Federal Government could help the long-run cause of economic growth and relieve the present recession. Yet the President is dramatic in his ambiguity in referring to it. I refer to liberalization of the tax laws in respect to allowances for recouping the cost of capital goods so their replacement may be financed. Today, because of the vast sums we have been spending in research and development, and the innovation that has resulted, one-third of our plant is obsolete. Good economics call for its replacement with the more efficient machines which have been developed. Yet our tax laws are geared to the economics of yesterday. We permit industry only to recoup the capital invested in a piece of equipment on the basis of when the equipment will wear out. Today equipment does not wear out as much as it becomes obsolete. We must adjust our tax laws to this new economic factor, if we are going to promote growth, not throttle it.

The President in his message talks about the performance of the economy in 1960 as being well below its capacity. What capacity? The truth is, we have very inadequate economic statistics to estimate industrial capacity. What figures we have include obsolete equipment, along with efficient equipment, simply because the obsolete is still on the books. Industry is certainly going to use its most efficient machinery first and let its obsolete machinery remain idle if there is any slack at all. Most of this unused capacity, I am afraid, is capacity that ought not to be used at all because of its obsolescence and inefficiency. This capacity should be junked and replaced with equipment of greater efficiency and capacity. This is the best way to solve our unused capacity. This unused capacity is the result of rapid economic growth, of dynamism. Yet it is referred to by the President's advisers of proof of the opposite—a sluggish and tired economy. A sluggish and tired economism has little or no obsolescence because there has been no innovation. Again we can solve the problem that economic growth creates by going backward. Is that where the new frontier is?

Yet, Mr. Kennedy wary of the views of Walter Reuther and other short-sighted labor leaders, I suspect, fails to come out clearly and openly for liberalized depreciation schedules. It is encouraging that he has not followed Mr. Reuther's lead as yet to the extent that he calls liberalized depreciation schedules an example of the "trickle down" theory of taxation. I hope the ambiguity which has led some people to believe that the President will recommend

liberalized depreciation schedules will be clarified in that direction soon. Our economy needs this reform badly.

As to Mr. Reuther and those who follow his theme, I would challenge them to answer this question: Is not fighting liberalized depreciation schedules an undercover way of fighting automation; of fighting progress?

Mr. Kennedy says:

Both full recovery and economic growth require expansion—for State and local government facilities.

The expansion of expenditures for State and local government facilities in the past few years has been astounding. Mr. Kennedy's message apparently has no concept of this expansion. Let me quote from a speech of Dr. Roger Freeman, "Are Bigger and Better Taxes Ahead?" which I placed in the Appendix of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 24, 1961, pages A445-A446; to place this matter in context:

So if we are to use a meaningful past rate of governmental expansion we should choose a year when the buildup of our national defense reached a stable level and the shrinkage in the value of the dollar came to a crawl. Nineteen hundred and fifty-two is such a year. Military outlays have since risen little and the dollar lost only 10 percent of its value.

This is what happened in the last 7 years (1952-59): public expenditures for war-connected purposes climbed from \$58.3 to \$59.8 billion (plus 3 percent); public expenditures for all other purposes climbed from \$41.5 to \$86.4 billion (plus 103 percent).

Let us view this in its proper perspective. Between 1952 and 1959 population expanded 13 percent; gross national product, national income, personal income increased about 40 percent; personal consumption increased 42 percent; governmental expenditures for civilian purposes grew 108 percent.

Never before in American history, not during the preceding 7 years, nor in the 1930's, did expenditures for public services expand so fast, absolutely or relatively. The past 7 years are without parallel in governmental growth in the United States.

This fact is sufficiently well known, for several reasons:

(a) Expenditures within the U.S. budget grew only 23 percent between 1952 and 1959 but Federal payments to the public outside the budget jumped 452 percent.

(b) War-collected outlays remained relatively stable.

(c) State and local finances grew much more rapidly than Federal finances but received less publicity.

The fact is that during the past 7 years expenditures for the major public services such as education, welfare and pensions, highways, natural resources, parks, etc., doubled or more than doubled. Yet, we are told that they have grown too slowly and that the rate ought to be sharply stepped up.

The historian Henry Steele Commager said a few months ago: "For who can doubt that—whether we like it or not—the welfare state is with us and is going to grow more rapidly in the next generation than it grew in the last."

If public services were simply to maintain, in the next 11 years, the annual rate of growth which they showed in the past 7, they would in 1970 cost considerably more than \$200 billion. Adding defense, foreign aid, veterans, and interest on the national debt, Government would be spending close to \$300 billion a year.

This could happen. But I doubt that it will. It is hard to conceive that the cost of

public services can keep doubling every 7 years.

For example, between 1922 and 1940 Federal revenues grew 64 percent, State-local revenues 113 percent; between 1944 and 1959 Federal revenues grew 68 percent, State-local revenues a spectacular 259 percent. During the last-mentioned period (1944-59) national income expanded 118 percent.

Does Mr. Kennedy really want this rate of expenditure expanded? I think he will do well, under the policies he is proposing, to maintain even a good percentage of the rate he has inherited.

ECONOMIC SHIFT FROM MANUFACTURING TO SERVICES

There is another basic economic phenomena which President Kennedy's economic messages ignore to which I would like to call attention. As a society's economy matures and technological advancement moves forward rapidly, the manufacturing sector begins to lose out, not in absolute figures or in productive capacity but in ratio to the fields of distribution and service. This natural process produces a stronger and more flexible economy. Yet this kind of a switch shows up poorly in the GNP indicator and, indeed, by itself, probably would reflect a decline. The shift which our society has been experiencing in post World War II years has brought better living through a better spread or distribution of the goods manufactured, more and better goods and services. It also has made our society economically stronger and more capable. This shift hopefully will continue. These are not essentially luxuries. Of the items listed under "services," of course, is education and training; also medical health. Good health means less absenteeism and better productivity; so does better housing mean better productivity; so do more leisure time and better recreation; so do more telephones; more electricity; more automobiles even if they do have tailfins; and more highways; and all the services that go with these items. To illustrate the point, I wish to quote from a speech I made on the floor of the House entitled "Red Growth Rate Found Lagging," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 5, pages 5790-5791:

The people who come to Washington to promote Federal aid for health and housing do so partly on the plea that this is good economics. Bad housing makes for bad health, which promotes low productivity of the worker, including greater absenteeism.

Does not poor housing and poor health facilities produce low productivity in Russia? The answer is that, of course, it does, and Russia, which has very poor housing, has a very low rate of productivity compared to the United States. For example, in urban areas Russia has 79 square feet of living space per person. The equivalent figure in the United States is 370 square feet per person. In Russia's new housing units in Moscow residents have 400 square feet per family of four. Each family shares a kitchen and bathroom with at least one other family. In 1959 in the United States in contrast, 61 percent of our nonfarm dwellers and 70 percent of farm dwellers owned their own homes and in standard metropolitan areas 93 percent of the owner-occupied units have full plumbing facilities and are classified as "not dilapidated."

One way of testing a nation's economic capabilities is through the electric power available to the nation.

In 1958 Russia had a total generating capacity of 53 million kilowatts. The same year the United States had a capability of over 167 million kilowatts.

In 1959 Russia jumped to 59 million kilowatts.

During the same period the United States jumped to 183 million kilowatts.

Russia's announced goal for 1965 is 110-112 million kilowatts.

The United States is expected to have about 245 million kilowatts in 1965.

One of the important aspects of power is its usability and this depends to a large degree upon transmission lines.

At the end of 1957 the total length of transmission on lines of 35,000 volts and above in Russia was about 46,485 miles.

In the United States the same year the total length of lines, 35,000 volts and above, was 240,000 miles.

I need not dwell on the fact that Russia has at least three times the distances to be covered as the United States.

In 1958, 80 percent of the power generated in Russia was devoted to industry and construction. Only about 16 percent went for rural and residential use.

In 1959 Russia produced 1,161 kilowatt-hours per capita.

In 1959 the United States produced 4,481 kilowatt-hours per capita.

The average home use of electricity in Russia is about 400 kilowatt-hours a year.

In the United States the average home use of power in 1959 was about 3,550 kilowatt-hours per year.

Just imagine how this affects productivity per worker. Just imagine how this relates to education, and home study entirely apart from the well-being of the people.

Incidentally there is practically no rural electrification in Russia and Russia's farm production utilizing half her population shows it.

But even in the area of utilization of personnel in the power industry itself which Russia has upgraded well ahead of almost any other industry we find some startling contrasts—as we should expect when we analyze the health, housing, and educational standards of Russia. Russia has shown remarkable progress for Russia, however. From 1950 to 1957 the number of personnel per megawatt of installed capacity was reduced from 9.6 to 5.6 persons. By 1958 in the larger power stations with a capacity of 500,000 kilowatts or over, the number of personnel was 2 to 2.5 persons per megawatt of installed capacity. In the United States, according to the Federal Power Commission, the large coal-burning plants built during the last decade require from 0.2 to 0.5 employees per megawatt of plant capacity.

Improvement in the somewhat intangible economic fields of service and distribution strengthens a society for both peace and war and the statements made by some of the President's advisers that these items are luxuries, thereby implying that they do not increase our economic capabilities and capacity are untrue.

OUR FUTURE

A lack of understanding of our successes as well as our problems may easily destroy that which has produced the progress. Much can be done and should be done to improve our economic picture. In certain areas healthy progress requires some basic legislation such as coping with technological unemployment through, as I have suggested, a basic addition to the unemployment insurance program. We also might increase our rate of expenditures in vocational educa-

tion. This is truly a bold proposal because Federal expenditures for vocational education have almost been tripled in the past 8 years.

The vitality of our economy is the private enterprise system. The key to this system is the free marketplace. Government's primary function is to keep the marketplace free so that the individual person can make his economic decisions. Just as in political science government's primary function is to keep the ballot box free so that the individual person can make his political decisions.

No economic oligarchy, or political bureaucracy, can over a period of time exceed the collective wisdom of the people in a society, either in the field of economics or in the field of political science. This can be a matter of faith; certainly the United States was established upon this belief. However, what knowledge is available to us through history and our own experiences should also convince us of it.

Today we are at our highest economic peak. The economy is dynamic, not sluggish and tired, and the problems that face us are those resulting from this dynamism. The New Frontier seeks to persuade us that we are tired and, to solve the problems that face us, we should go to a paternalistic state. This will undermine the incentive of our people which is the wellspring of progress. This will solve the problems of economic growth by eliminating economic growth. It is a course I trust we as a nation will refuse to follow.

HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that housing construction is one of the proven stimulants to our entire economy. But there is much more to the problem of increasing this construction than just decreasing the interest rates on FHA insured mortgage loans.

One of the best articles on this housing subject for 1961 which it has been my privilege to read was by Prof. Fred E. Case of the Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California at Los Angeles, prepared for the Savings and Loan Journal, official publication of the California Savings and Loan League.

His prediction on what is ahead for housing in 1961 reads as follows:

Unlike many previous years, housing has not helped bolster the economy in 1960 but has been suffering something of a decline. Only in the last quarter has housing construction increased sufficiently to keep 1960 from being one of the low construction years. Approximately 1,260,000 housing units will be started (using the new Bureau of the Census) and the dollar volume of private nonfarm residential construction will equal approximately \$21.3 billion.

SOME QUESTIONS

What will happen in 1961 depends upon the answers to a number of questions:

1. Is there a significant and permanent adjustment between the demand for and the supply of housing?

Although vacancy rates in single-family homes for sale continues to hover around 1 percent, those in residential rental units have been climbing steadily and are now fluctuating between 7 and 8 percent.

2. Must depreciation or loss of capital now be included as a cost of property ownership or investing?

Depreciation has been treated for so long as a form of tax-free income that investors forget that real estate is basically a wasting asset. The slight inflationary bias of the economy will probably make this less important in new properties, but the increasing balance between supply and demand undoubtedly presages the incidence of real depreciation charges in older properties.

3. Will recentralization accelerate?

The costs of extending sewage lines, utilities, roads, and other facilities to the extreme suburbs has now reached a point of marginal returns for both builders and local governments so that recentralization is becoming increasingly attractive. Moreover, an increasing proportion of the population is being made up of young married couples and retired persons, both seeking the cheaper, more easily maintained apartments found in central districts. Undoubtedly the massive urban redevelopment programs being promised as antirecession measures will hasten this trend.

4. What of the impact of rapidly rising property taxes?

As local governments face rising demands for varieties of public services they are shifting the costs increasingly to property tax rolls. Sales and payroll taxes are constantly being threatened, but property taxes continue to rise. Under such conditions, renters are a little better off because rental levels and rental competition may not permit the landlord to shift all of the rising tax burden to his tenants.

5. What about the role of income tax advantages?

As the new administration seeks ways of closing loopholes in the Federal income tax law, there is increasing evidence that mortgage interest and property taxes may be eliminated as deductions for property owners. While no such drastic measures would probably be taken, nevertheless, there is a good possibility that these advantages could be modified in some degree.

6. Will there be an increase in "social investments" by the present administration?

Another promise of the new administration has been more social investments will be undertaken. Included in such investments would be programs of public housing, veterans' housing, housing for the aged and low cost housing. Such investments would obviously stimulate the construction industry and bolster sagging prices in some areas. For example, outstanding credit commitments of the Federal Government are now in the neighborhood of \$60 billion.

7. What about the increases in nondiscrimination housing legislation?

A surprising large potential market for medium price housing exists among all minority groups who have enjoyed above average income increases in many areas. As these groups find new markets open to them, they could generate a relatively modest but important supplementary housing demand.

8. Will land costs continue to rise?

The shift to multifamily construction has been occasioned in many cases by the high costs of residential lots. The high rate of urbanization offers little hope of reduced

land costs unless new methods can be devised for manufacturing land cheaply.

There are some events in the marketplace about which questions need to be raised, at least in 1961. The overall effect of these events, about which only hypotheses can be raised at the present time, is generally to act as a brake on any extensive increasing in either housing sales or construction:

(a) In spite of the population explosion which is being cited as a cause for business optimism, families usually do not enter the housing market until the head of the household is in his late thirties. This particular age group will not cause an appreciable impact on housing demand until 1963 or later.

(b) The gap between rental costs and home ownership costs is narrowing rapidly in favor of renting primarily because of high property taxes, interest rates, building and maintenance costs. The rapid increase in apartments is also keeping rents within reasonable ranges. For example, in 1955, 102,000 new apartments were built as compared to 257,000 in 1959.

(c) The changing age structure previously alluded to, will create a demand for smaller units as more and more households come to be made up of single persons, retired couples, young couples, all of whom will have relatively limited incomes.

(d) The change from the fabulous fifties to the soaring sixties is still primarily only a change of numbers. Often overlooked is the fact that numerous economic indicators show there are some knotty problems which must be worked out in the early part of this decade if the promises of the decade are to be realized.

(e) One of the real obstacles to home ownership and construction is the consistently high level of mortgage interest rates. A modicum of relief is in sight but will probably have only slight impact because of the high costs of lending operations faced by institutional lenders, who supply 90 percent or more of the mortgage money. In addition, there is little likelihood that demands for funds from other parts of the economy will be diminished to any extent nor does there appear to be much chance for a significant increase in personal savings which form the base for much mortgage lending.

(f) In many ways 1959 and 1960 were unusually poor years and were running counter to secular movements. It is highly unlikely that 1961 could go any lower.

THE PROMISE OF 1961

Perhaps the previous observation is the best clue as to what can be expected in 1961. Housing can't go any lower, but there are too many depressants to keep it from rising too high. Most prognosticators predict between a 3 and 5 percent overall increase in all aspects of the housing and construction markets. The results need to be compared with what have been accepted as average annual needs of the sixties because of the promises this generated for better markets in the late sixties. Private and public new construction in 1960 will equal approximately \$55.4 billion as compared to an annual decade average need of between \$58 and \$60 billion. Nineteen hundred and sixty-one will probably produce a total of \$57.6 billion. Private nonfarm residential construction has been estimated at \$21.3 billion for 1960, at an annual needed rate of \$20 to \$23 billion for the decade and will probably equal \$22.2 billion for 1961 or 53 percent of total new construction by private investors. Housing starts for 1960 have been estimated at 1,299,000 of which 1,268,000 were private starts. The annual needs for the decade have been placed at between 1.5 and 1.7 million. Housing starts for 1961 will probably equal 1,315,000 for the private sector and 35,000 for the public sector for a total of 1,350,000.

In California residential construction will probably equal approximately 12 percent of

the national total which would mean approximately 155,000 units or expenditures of \$2.5 to \$3 billion.

NEEDED: NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the President, in his state of the Union address, has stressed the great importance of higher education to our Nation and to our national future. Education has rightly been called our first line of defense. The challenge of the Soviet Union, which is graduating more scientists, professionals and engineers every year makes it imperative that we redouble our own efforts in this supremely vital field.

And yet, it has been estimated that over half of our qualified high school graduates do not attend college. To say that this is an appalling waste of our greatest national resource is, at best, an understatement. Every one of these young people represents a frightening loss to our future potential.

A major reason, of course, is the financial one. At least 100,000 qualified graduates do not go on to college each year simply because they cannot afford it.

This is not merely a personal problem, or a local problem: it is national in scope and implication. It has become a national obligation to provide the educational opportunity which is so clearly in the national interest.

Some progress, of course, was made through the National Defense Education Act, which initiated a program of loans and fellowships in 1958. Through the provisions of this act a number of young people who otherwise might not have been able to attend college have been enabled to do so. But if anything is clear from the implementation of this act, it is that we have made only a bare beginning.

In order to expand the scope of this act, I suggest that we initiate a program of scholarships, in addition to loans, on the undergraduate level. Many of us will recall that this was part of the original concept of the 1958 act, which, however, did not survive the conference.

I have introduced a bill for this purpose, and I urge that it be given careful consideration along with the other proposals for expanding the National Defense Education Act to meet the urgently critical and pressing needs of our prospective college applicants.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION THROUGH THE OECD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York, [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the convention establishing the OECD has been sent to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is now considering the convention and has heard witnesses from the executive branch and private organizations.

It is essential that the United States become a member of the OECD. Both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs have said that failure of the United States to approve this convention and join the Organization would be a lethal blow to economic cooperation between North America and Western Europe.

There are many difficult problems facing the United States today which cannot be solved without the cooperation of our friends in Canada and Western Europe. The proposed OECD would provide an excellent means for regular consultation on these problems among the 20 countries who will be members of the Organization.

The United States is concerned with measures to invigorate our economy while also improving our balance-of-payments position. As Secretary Dillon said in his presentation before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the effectiveness of such measures will depend in part on the extent to which the major Western European countries pursue compatible policies. The days are gone when we could take measures to stimulate our economy without regard to their international repercussions and without considering the impact on the U.S. economy of measures taken by the major Western European countries. The OECD will be an extremely useful mechanism for coordinating the economic policies of the members.

The other major economic problem facing us is the determination of the less-developed countries rapidly to increase the standard of living of their peoples. The OECD Convention recognizes that the member countries must act together to help the less-developed countries help themselves by increasing the assistance made available to them by the major industrialized countries of the Atlantic area.

As Secretary Ball pointed out in his presentation before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the objectives of stimulating economic growth among the OECD members and of providing increased assistance to the less-developed countries cannot be dealt with in an international context without considering broad trade policies. Accordingly, the OECD also has as an aim the promotion of policies by the member countries to contribute to the expansion of world trade. However, this does not mean, as some of the opponents of the OECD have claimed, that the OECD will administer the GATT or engage in tariff negotiations.

We have been assured by the Secretary of State, by the Secretary of the Treasury, and by the Under Secretary

of State for Economic Affairs that the OECD will not be a trade organization, and will neither establish nor administer trade rules. Nor will the OECD conduct tariff negotiations.

Thus, both for the positive things the OECD will be and for the negative things the OECD will not be, the United States should join the OECD.

The new Organization for Economic Cooperation can be of great usefulness to the United States. I am convinced that the fears which have been expressed are completely without basis and I earnestly hope that there will be no delay in our acceptance of the convention and that the Organization will come into being at the earliest possible date.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today is commemorated the 141st anniversary of the birth of a great American citizen and woman, Susan B. Anthony.

Her life was dedicated to the noble purpose of achieving equality for women. Today the women of America are indebted to her not only because of legal recognition for their status, but more important, because of the opportunities afforded them to contribute to the cultural, intellectual, and professional activities of our great Nation. Thus, a new source of strength and energy was infused into our national life by this recognition.

Susan B. Anthony was a native of Massachusetts. But her cause for woman suffrage affected not only the entire United States but the influence of her movement extended far beyond our shores. To women everywhere, she will always remain the symbol for a cause which is not only noble, but which is grounded in the very fundamentals of right. Her influence has given hope to women who are still under laws of inequality.

Her native State has honored her memory by celebrating a day in her honor on August 26, the day that equal suffrage became law as an amendment to the Constitution. On this, her birthday, we join with our colleagues in paying tribute to her memory and with women everywhere who are grateful for her having lived a life of dedication to their cause.

EXPORTS OF MACHINE TOOLS TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I view with serious concern the reports in the press yesterday, February 16, 1961, that the Department of Commerce has just indicated it has authorized shipment to the U.S.S.R. of \$1,500,000 worth of precision machinery. According to the accounts these machines could, and presumably would, be put to military use by the Russians.

Involved is a shipment of some 45 precision grinding machines. They are one of a number of components in the making of small ballbearings.

Authority for this transaction, it is reported, was first approved last year but approval was suspended due to objections by the Department of Defense on the grounds that the equipment could have only military use. It appears from these reports that the Department of Defense still objects to this shipment but that the Department of Commerce has, in effect, overruled these objections.

In this connection, I believe that the Congress and the public would be interested in knowing of other authorizations granted by the Department of Commerce last year for the export of \$6,110,000 worth of machines, described as being for the manufacture of automobile parts.

One of these authorizations was for the export of a multistation machine for machining V-8 cylinder blocks, of a value of \$3,400,000, and for a multistation machine for machining V-8 cylinder heads, of a value of \$1,900,000.

Briefly these machines can mill, drill, bore, ream, tap, etc., aluminum castings for V-8 cylinder blocks and heads. Machines of this type can be used in the mass production of all metal manufactures, such as refrigerators, tractors, electrical motors, etc.

The other authorization was for the export to the U.S.S.R. of six 8-spindle gear hobbing machines, with a total value of \$810,000. These machines can be used in plants which manufacture gears for automobiles, trucks, tractors, and farm implements. They are a mass production machine for gears of wide application. Both spiral and straight tooth gears can be cut on these machines.

The purchaser in the U.S.S.R. for the gear hobbing and the multistation machines is the Soviet organization Stankoimport, which is the central Soviet organization for importing metalworking machinery. The exact location of where these machines will be used is not known to the Department of Commerce. Presumably the exact use to which they will be put is not known to the Department either, although it is stated that they are to be used for the manufacture of automobile parts.

My information is that these machines, for which the export licenses will expire on June 1, 1961—for the multistation machine tools—and July 22, 1961—for the gear hobbing machines—had not been shipped as of several days ago.

Because in my view exports of this type involve questions of extreme importance, which should be looked into thoroughly by Congress, I have introduced House Resolution 170 to authorize and direct a full and complete investigation and study of the administration,

operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949.

I feel there exists a pressing need to evaluate the Export Control Act and its administration by the Department of Commerce to determine the effect on our national security of the decisions made and policies established in carrying out the act. It is my further belief that the Congress needs to look closely into the manner in which the Department of Commerce performs its duty, as required under the act, of consulting with other departments of Government interested in the export policies established under the Export Control Act.

A basic question that must be faced, of course, is in regard to what type of trade should be authorized with the Soviet bloc. Obviously, for example, in the case of the precision machine tools to manufacture ballbearings, there is a serious difference of opinion as to whether export of such machines should be allowed. The policies established under the act are of vital significance, for their possible effect in contributing to both Soviet military and economic and trade warfare potential, and, in my view, we must exercise utmost caution.

I believe strongly in American industry and know full well that we must do business to operate. Furthermore, we need to maintain employment in every way reasonably possible. But at the same time I believe that we must evaluate these matters very thoroughly on the basis of their effect on national security. Let us not be lulled into falling for short-term, illusory gains such as might result from the sale of such machinery if at the same time such a transaction could adversely affect our entire national security and thus prove to be to the detriment of all of us. I firmly hope that action may be taken immediately on this resolution.

BRUSSELS PLANE DISASTER

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is stunned by the plane disaster near Brussels yesterday which wiped out 73 lives, including 17 members of our U.S. figure skating team.

Only a few Sundays ago, millions of us sat enchanted before our television sets watching the dazzling skill of these youngsters competing at Colorado Springs. It is especially poignant to recall the excitement in their voices as they told of their forthcoming trip to Prague for the international contest.

Three of the victims of the crash were from Winchester, in the Fifth District of Massachusetts, Mrs. Maribel Vinson Owen and her two daughters, Laurence and Maribel. Mrs. Owen, a great champion in her own right, held nine national championships. Both her lovely daughters were following in the tracks of their mother's silver skates. Laurence

at 16 was North American figure skating champion; Maribel held the U.S. pairs championship with Dudley Richards, of Boston, another casualty of the crash.

Words are insufficient when tragedy such as this strikes. My heartfelt sympathy goes to the families of all the victims of this shocking accident.

TELEVISION COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives so as to authorize committees in their discretion to permit the broadcasting and telecasting of their proceedings by radio and television and the dissemination of news of committee proceedings through all media of communication.

The text of this resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 173

That rule XI 26(g) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(g)", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Each committee may, upon such terms and conditions as it deems advisable, permit the broadcasting and telecasting of its proceedings by radio and television, and the dissemination of news of its proceedings by such methods and by other methods and media of communication."

Mr. Speaker, this amendment to the House rules is urgently needed.

In the 82d Congress the Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, in answer to a parliamentary inquiry propounded by the then minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, ruled that committees had no power to authorize telecasting or broadcasting of their public hearings on the grounds that the rules of the House, which are expressly made the rules of its committees, are silent and do not expressly authorize committees to permit telecasting and broadcasting of their hearings.

The parliamentary inquiry and the ruling on it were prompted by hearings being held at that time by the House Un-American Activities Committee in the city of Detroit. Until the Speaker's ruling was made, that committee had permitted its proceedings to be televised and broadcast—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 1, pages 1334-1335.

In the 83d Congress under Speaker MARTIN, of Massachusetts, without any formal ruling, House committees were authorized to permit telecasting and broadcasting of their proceedings and did, in fact, allow such broadcasting and telecasting and other reporting of their proceedings by photography, moving pictures, and so forth.

In the 84th Congress—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 1, page 628—I propounded a parliamentary inquiry to the Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, as the result of which the Speaker ruled that commit-

tees were not authorized to permit telecasting or broadcasting or photographic coverage of their committee proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that I interpret the rules as they now stand as containing authority for the Speaker to permit broadcasting, telecasting, and photography of proceedings in the Chamber of the House of Representatives in the Speaker's discretion and, accordingly, as authorizing committees to do the same. Apparently this was the interpretation that Speaker MARTIN also placed on the rules.

To resolve all doubt, however, I believe the rules should be amended as I am now proposing in the resolution I introduced today. This, or a similar resolution, has been introduced by me in each Congress commencing with the 84th, as follows:

Eighty-fourth Congress, House Resolution 99, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 1, page 494.

Eighty-fifth Congress, House Resolution 285, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 8, pages 10025-10026.

Eighty-sixth Congress, House Resolution 64, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 1, page 62.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the House of Representatives should have the right to make a determination on this most basic matter of House policy. Although I have consistently pressed for action on this resolution in previous Congresses, no action was taken nor were hearings held.

I commend the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] for having set hearings to commence next Tuesday, February 21, on this subject. Action is long overdue and the House should no longer be prevented from expressing its views on this most important subject of interest not only to each Member, but to the power, prestige, and welfare of the House of Representatives itself.

Mr. Speaker, in a government such as ours, where the people are sovereign, the electorate should have the fullest information possible about the public business, the manner in which elected and appointed officials are discharging the responsibilities which they hold in trust for the American people, and so that the decisions which the electorate itself makes from time to time can be founded upon the most complete and most accurate information possible.

In obtaining this information the public ought to be permitted full use of all the media of communication, including the recent history-making advances in radio and television. At public hearings of committees anyone is entitled to attend as a spectator. Is it not rank discrimination against those who have neither the time nor the money to travel to the seat of government to be excluded as witnesses to public hearings of committees by denying to them the use of television and radio and still and moving photography to enable them to learn about the public business?

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has no prohibition against telecasting its committee hearings and we all recall how many Senate committees have become familiar in every household in the United States

through the telecasting and broadcasting of their proceedings. You will remember the Kefauver investigation of interstate crime, the Army-McCarthy hearings, and the McClellan committee hearings on labor racketeering.

Beginning with President Eisenhower the President's press conferences have been telecast. Thus, the public becomes familiar with the President and his views and the Senators and their views and activities. But there is a blackout on House committees and the public has no direct access to these committees except as they may appear in person as spectators. They obtain their knowledge only from newspaper accounts of hearings and such television, radio, and photographic coverage as can be obtained outside the committee room. Thus, the people are less aware of the activities of House committees and are less well informed on the subjects of national interest with which those committees deal, and naturally have a tendency to downgrade the House and its contribution to our national policies. This tends to impair the prestige and the influence on public opinion of the House of Representatives and its Members and thus weakens what has been called the greatest parliamentary body in the world instead of strengthening it.

I sincerely hope that the hearings of the Rules Committee will show the desirability of this reform in House procedure and that the newly constituted House Rules Committee will not bottle up this salutary measure but will permit the House of Representatives to work its will on this basic procedural reform.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CORMAN, for the period February 17 through February 24, on account of official business in his district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, for 15 minutes, today, and on Monday, February 20, 1961.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS, for 1 hour, on February 23 and February 24.

Mr. MADDEN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. HOEVEN), today, for 1 hour.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. LANGEN), for 30 minutes, on Monday, February 20, 1961.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, February 21, 1961, to speak on the anniversary of the sinking of the U.S.S. *Maine*.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. INOUE to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Flood) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILBERT.
Mr. FRIEDEL.
Mr. SANTANGELO.
Mr. BOLAND.
Mr. FALLON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELL.
Mrs. DWYER.
Mr. MATHIAS.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 681. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 683. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 20, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

JANUARY 13, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	Counsel	\$8,772.00
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	8,051.46
Christine S. Gallagher	Clerk	7,612.08
Hyde H. Murray	Assistant clerk	6,613.22
Lydia Vucin	Staff assistant	4,727.28
Betty M. Prezioso	do	4,727.28
Pauline E. Graves	do	4,484.28
Gladys N. Ondarcho	do	3,998.22
Judith Phillips	Staff assistant (July 1 to Oct. 1, 1960)	1,290.27
Peggy Jean Lamm	Staff assistant (Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1960)	2,597.96
Joan M. Lemense	Staff assistant (Sept. 1 to 10, 1960)	160.24

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 8,008.30
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 1, 1960 4,152.47

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 1, 1960 12,250.77
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 1, 1960 37,749.23

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth Sprankle	Clerk and staff director	\$8,824.74
Paul M. Wilson	do	8,824.74
Carson W. Culp	Staff assistant	8,754.48
Samuel W. Crosby	do	8,754.48
Jay B. Howe	do	8,578.68
Ross P. Pope	do	8,578.68
Robert M. Moyer	do	8,578.68
Frank Sanders	do	8,051.46
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	8,051.46
Robert P. Williams	Editor	7,260.66
Aubrey A. Gunnels	Staff assistant	6,909.12
Robert L. Michaels	do	6,733.38
Kelly Campbell	do	6,294.00
G. Homer Skarin	do	5,942.52
Earl C. Slusby	do	5,634.96
Francis G. Merrill	do	5,634.96
Lawrence C. Miller	Assistant editor	4,605.78
Ralph Preston	Staff assistant	4,217.62
Donald F. Berens	Clerical assistant	3,305.70
Kenneth A. Meade	do	3,294.42
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	2,124.84
George S. Green	Clerk to the minority	8,051.46
Nancie Hammack	Clerk-stenographer	2,150.45
Gloria Jean Kilgore	do	1,817.79
Viola W. Grubbs	do	3,086.82
Rose Marie Kline	do	3,086.82
Jeanne C. Smith	do	3,086.82
Rosalind E. McGovern	do	3,086.82
June R. Austin	do	3,086.82
Patrick M. Hayes	do	3,086.82
Catherine D. Norrell	do	3,086.82
Donald L. Bernard	do	3,086.82
Phyllis N. Troy	do	3,086.82
William J. Neary	do	3,086.82
George C. Drescher, Jr.	do	2,884.32
Ruth R. Hollowell	do	2,783.04
Silas Taber	do	3,086.82
Elmer L. Maloney	do	3,086.82
Alice Beach	do	3,086.82
Robert Dunkel	do	3,086.82
Josephine Birdsall	do	3,086.82
David R. Hansen	do	3,086.82
Margie H. Trew	do	3,086.82
Ruth Mahder	do	2,884.32
Anne Ryall Sylvester	do	2,884.32
John Henry Murphy	do	2,884.32
Esther T. Purser	do	787.80
Alfred E. Andersen	do	1,028.94
Patricia Ann Greaver	do	826.42
Mary Lucy Walker	do	1,269.03
James D. Burris	Staff assistant	1,495.57
Eleanor G. Barnes	Clerk-stenographer	514.47
Alexander J. Smith	do	758.90
Lucille K. Brand	do	514.47
Barbara A. Prah	do	514.47

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures

Amount of expenditures previously reported 8,008.30
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960 225,571.33

Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960 225,571.33

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1961

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIONS STAFF)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph K. Ponder	Director, surveys and investigations staff	\$7,281.12
Kenneth T. Delavigne	Assistant director, surveys and investigations staff	7,084.86
William B. Soyars	do	7,104.63
Lillian M. Mackie	Stenographer	3,289.38
Helen C. Parrish	do	2,985.60
John J. Donnelly	Consultant	7,500.00
George Y. Harvey	do	50.00

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Agriculture, Department of		
Magee, Leroy F.	Investigator	\$755.90
Struttman, Ernest L.	do	3,309.25
Army, Department of		
Cranks, Joseph R.	do	4,773.00
Atomic Energy Commission		
Olmslad, Lawrence R.	do	3,735.95
Civil Service Commission		
McQuoid, George J.	do	4,974.47
Federal Bureau of Investigation		
Bennett, Carl L.	do	6,487.44
Bolz, Charles	do	6,633.20
Brent, Aubrey S.	do	4,968.00
Chisholm, Leslie B., Jr.	do	6,084.96
Crowley, Theodore P.	do	5,435.52
Durland, Peter R.	do	3,814.40
Giovannetti, Carlton	do	6,487.44
Grealy, Francis P.	do	5,315.76
Haebe, James C.	do	4,477.92
Hayden, Albert C., Jr.	do	6,622.72
Hayes, Edward Joseph	do	6,633.20
Health benefits fund		867.23
Leen, Maurice P.	Investigator	5,279.36
Life insurance fund		421.50
Love, Warren L.	Investigator	6,487.44
Martinson, Walter C.	do	4,968.00
Murphy, Peter J., Jr.	do	5,830.60
McEliece, Richard F.	do	3,577.60
Oldham, David W.	do	3,194.88
Reamy, W. Wallace	do	5,663.52
Retirement fund		8,508.94
Ruhl, John A.	Investigator	5,713.20
Tucker, George R.	do	6,487.44
Vahey, Eugene W.	do	5,663.52
Vericker, William A.	do	5,009.20
Walters, Leonard M.	do	5,663.52
Wood, H. Branch	do	6,487.44
Woolf, Richard M.	do	5,940.40
Young, Roger	do	3,165.36
General Services Administration		
Chapman, Howard K., Jr.	do	4,175.14
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of		
Monahan, John F.	do	2,283.00
Interior, Department of		
Rice, Harry W.	do	3,629.64
Navy, Department of		
Williams, Ben M.	do	5,321.28
Travel and miscellaneous expense		56,830.32
Transfer to fiscal year 1960 account		23,500.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$500,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	-----
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960.....	300,482.30
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960.....	300,482.30
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960.....	199,517.70

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to January 1, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart.....	Chief counsel.....	\$8,824.74
John R. Blandford.....	Counsel.....	8,798.40
Philip W. Kelleher.....	do.....	8,798.40
Frank M. Slatinshek.....	do.....	7,796.64
Oneta L. Stockstill.....	Committee secretary.....	4,676.70
Berniece Kalinowski.....	Secretary.....	4,676.70
L. Louise Ellis.....	do.....	4,676.70
Marie M. Abbott.....	do.....	3,861.48
M. Jane Binger.....	do.....	3,547.56
James A. Deakins.....	Bill clerk.....	3,547.56

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL OPERATING PURSUANT TO H. RES. 19 AND 20, 86TH CONG.

John J. Courtney.....	Special counsel.....	\$8,824.74
William H. Sandweg.....	Assistant counsel.....	6,975.00
Dorothy Britton.....	Secretary.....	4,403.28
Jane Wheelahan.....	do.....	3,456.42
Adeline Tolerton.....	Clerk.....	3,248.82

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	91,850.02
Amount expended from July 1, 1960, to Jan. 1, 1961.....	28,102.42

Total amount expended from January 1959 to January 1961.....	119,952.44
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1961.....	30,047.56

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert L. Cardon.....	Clerk and general counsel.....	\$8,824.74
John E. Barriere.....	Majority staff member.....	8,824.74

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink.....	Minority staff member.....	\$8,824.74
Robert R. Poston.....	Counsel.....	8,824.74
Helen L. Rogers (nee Helen E. Long).....	Deputy clerk.....	5,204.16
Mary W. Layton.....	Assistant clerk.....	5,204.16
John M. Devlin.....	Editor (terminated Sept. 30, 1960).....	3,586.38
Marguerite Bean.....	Secretary to chairman.....	6,030.36
Alicia F. Shoemaker.....	Secretary to minority.....	4,838.70
Roger J. Brown.....	Editor (began service Oct. 1, 1960).....	3,002.01

EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 81 SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Kenneth W. Burrows.....	Economist.....	\$7,796.64
Eleanor N. Hamilton.....	Research assistant.....	3,547.56
John J. McEwan, Jr.....	Assistant staff director.....	8,824.74
Grady Perry, Jr.....	Clerk.....	5,397.48
Margaret E. Tucker.....	Secretary.....	4,307.04
Frances Yeakle.....	do.....	3,491.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$205,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	103,701.35
Amount expended from June 1 to Dec. 31, 1960.....	38,818.09
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960.....	142,519.44
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960.....	62,480.56

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick.....	Staff director.....	\$8,824.74
William R. Foley.....	General counsel.....	8,824.74
Walter M. Besterman.....	Legislative assistant.....	8,824.74
Murray Drabkin.....	Counsel.....	6,733.38
Herbert N. Maletz.....	Counsel (from Dec. 1, 1960).....	1,429.78
William H. Crabtree.....	Associate counsel.....	7,245.98
Carrie Lou Allen.....	Clerical staff.....	3,795.66
Anne J. Berger.....	do.....	5,397.48
Jane Caldwell.....	Clerical staff (from Oct. 1, 1960).....	1,644.69
Frances F. Christy.....	Clerical staff.....	5,204.16
James G. Cline.....	Assistant counsel.....	5,397.48
Helen Goldsmith.....	Clerical staff.....	4,842.06
Velma Snedley.....	do.....	5,397.48

SALARIES PAID JULY 1, 1960, THROUGH DEC. 31, 1960, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 27, H. RES. 92, AND H. RES. 425, 86TH CONG.

Employee	Profession	Salary
Appel, Leonard.....	Assistant counsel.....	\$6,733.38
Beland, Lorraine W.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	143.36
Burak, Gertrude C.....	Clerk-typist.....	4,504.50
Caldwell, Jane C.....	Clerk-typist (to Oct. 1, 1960).....	1,644.69
Dunn, Dorothy H.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	\$65.80
Eisenberg, Roberta E.....	do.....	3,795.66

SALARIES PAID JULY 1, 1960, THROUGH DEC. 31, 1960, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 27, H. RES. 92, AND H. RES. 425, 86TH CONG.—continued

Employee	Profession	Salary
Finger, Alexander E.....	Assistant counsel.....	\$6,381.90
Flynn, Catherine M.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	556.61
Fuchs, Herbert.....	Assistant counsel.....	6,733.38
Jett, R. Frederick.....	do.....	6,645.48
Kelenonick, Michael.....	Clerk.....	3,593.16
Maletz, Herbert N.....	Chief counsel, anti-trust (to Dec. 1, 1960).....	7,148.90
Meekins, Elizabeth G.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	3,759.66
Peet, Richard C.....	Assistant counsel.....	4,112.79
Robin, Stephen.....	Clerical staff assistant.....	714.23
Rubenstein, Howard J.....	Assistant counsel.....	1,799.16
Sanders, Marleah.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	229.68
Shea, Mary Pat.....	do.....	2,884.32
Sigman, Julian H.....	Associate chief counsel, anti-trust.....	7,348.50
Sky, Theodore.....	Assistant counsel.....	3,776.10
Walden, Jerrold L.....	do.....	3,383.15
Williams, Stephen L.....	Messenger.....	2,377.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$425,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	252,522.24
Amount expended from July 1, 1960, through Dec. 31, 1960.....	95,534.40

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, through Dec. 31, 1960.....	348,056.64
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960.....	76,943.36
Funds for preparation of United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and revision of the laws:	
A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1960.....	83,505.77
Expended June 30-Dec. 31, 1960.....	21,895.56
Balance, Dec. 31, 1960.....	61,610.21

D. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1960.....	\$5,313.84
Expended June 30-Dec. 31, 1960.....	8,617.93
Balance, Dec. 31, 1960.....	76,695.91

C. Revision of the laws, 1960:	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1960.....	1,677.94
Expended June 30-Dec. 31, 1960.....	1,635.63
Balance, Dec. 31, 1960 (to be returned to Treasury).....	42.31

D. Revision of the laws, 1961:	
Received from Legislative Appropriation Act, 1961.....	18,150.00
Expended June 30-Dec. 31, 1960.....	8,873.24
Balance, Dec. 31, 1960.....	9,276.76

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hayden S. Garber.....	Counsel.....	\$8,051.46
Leonard O. Hilder.....	Investigator.....	5,942.62
W. N. McLeod, Jr.....	Clerk.....	8,557.99
Dixon D. Davis.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,537.42
Donald J. Tubridy.....	Minority clerk.....	5,397.48
Ruth Butterworth.....	Secretary.....	4,767.78
Ann L. Puryear.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,065.74
Lillian B. Hamilton.....	do.....	3,390.60
Ellen M. Coxeter.....	do.....	3,188.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 143, Feb. 24, 1959).....\$10,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported.....3,833.26
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960.....1,033.10

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960.....6,166.74

JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Russell C. Derrickson	Chief investigator	\$8,772.00
Charles M. Ryan	General counsel	8,772.00
Melvin W. Sneed	Minority clerk	8,772.00
Charles T. Lane	Assistant clerk	8,772.00
Levi K. Alderman, Jr.	Chief clerk	8,772.00
Kathryn Kivett	Assistant clerk	3,917.22
Jeanne E. Thomson	do	3,917.22
Gladyss M. Rafter	do	3,917.22
Ira S. Miller	do	3,917.22
James B. Wells	do	4,118.82
Olive M. Gibbons	Stenographer (July 1 to 10, inclusive)	130.54
Colie V. Williamson	Field investigator (July 1 to 10, inclusive)	185.39
Elizabeth W. Adams	Stenographer (through Sept. 10)	1,009.04
Harry V. Barnard	Research assistant (through Aug. 31)	1,612.90
Reva Beck Bosone	Legal counsel	6,733.38
Mary M. Callaway	Stenographer	2,691.84
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk	1,347.66
Mary Sue Leonard	Secretary	3,301.17
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	5,325.00
John D. Messick	Assistant to director	6,982.20
J. Noble Richards	Staff assistant (minority)	5,378.16
Russell H. Riggs	Clerk (through Sept. 15)	1,578.92
W. Wilson Young	Counsel	6,733.38
Jane L. Wilson	Stenographer (effective Aug. 22)	2,115.37
Charles E. Wilson	Clerk (effective Sept. 1)	2,668.84

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$328,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported.....219,362.03
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31.....74,238.02
 Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31.....293,600.05
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960.....44,080.82

Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, to-

gether with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator	\$8,824.74
Roy J. Bullock	Senior staff consultant	8,723.70
Albert C. F. Westphal	Staff consultant	8,723.70
Franklin J. Schupp	do	8,644.62
Henry E. Billingsley	Consultant	8,600.70
Harry C. Cromer	Investigator-consultant	7,528.62
June Nieh	Senior staff assistant	6,294.00
Winifred G. Osborne	Staff assistant	5,942.32
Helen C. Mattas	do	5,527.98
Myrtle M. Melvin	do	5,397.48
Helen L. Hashagen	do	5,397.48
Mary Louise O'Brien	do	5,300.82
Ann L. Clark	do	3,228.60
Robert J. Bowen	Clerical assistant	3,937.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$150,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported.....59,747.29
 Amount expended from July 1, to December 31, 1960.....\$39,804.74

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959 to June 30, 1960.....99,552.03

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960.....50,447.97

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1960, to January 3, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses, July 1, 1960, through Jan. 3, 1961:
 Full committee (expenses).....\$2,471.97
 Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.....45,592.01
 Military Operations Subcommittee.....35,506.49
 Government Activities Subcommittee.....25,667.84
 Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.....24,440.06
 Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.....36,858.09
 Special Donable Property Subcommittee.....17,594.45
 Special Government Information Subcommittee.....33,165.29
 Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems.....11,942.22
 Special Subcommittee on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....711.30
 Salaries, full committee, July 1-Dec. 31, 1960:
 Christine Ray Davis, staff director.....8,824.74
 Orville S. Poland, general counsel.....8,824.74
 James A. Lanigan, associate general counsel.....8,824.74
 Earle J. Wade, staff member.....5,378.16
 J. Robert Brown, staff member.....6,733.38
 Dolores Fel'Dotto, staff member.....4,727.28
 Ann E. McLachlan, staff member.....4,281.72
 Patricia Maheux, staff member.....3,998.22
 Helen M. Boyer, minority professional staff.....8,051.45
 J. P. Carlson, minority counsel.....7,401.18
 Full committee, travel, publications, telephone, stationery, and supplies (full committee and subcommittees), total.....2,471.97

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman:
 Elmer W. Henderson, counsel.....7,872.96
 Phineas Indritz, counsel.....7,872.96
 Orville J. Montgomery, associate counsel.....7,216.36
 Arthur Perlman, investigator.....7,216.36
 David Glick, associate counsel.....5,952.20
 Lawrence P. Redmond, clerk.....5,467.80
 Irene Manning, stenographer.....3,704.53
 Expenses.....288.84
 Total.....45,592.01

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:
 Herbert Roback, staff administrator.....\$8,971.82
 Earl J. Morgan, chief investigator (July 1-Sept. 20, 1960).....2,992.61
 John Paul Ridgely, investigator.....5,862.80
 Douglas G. Dahlin, staff attorney.....4,785.51
 Robert J. McElroy, investigator.....4,579.58
 Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer.....4,064.86
 Catherine L. Koeberlein, clerk-stenographer.....4,064.86
 Expenses.....184.36
 Total.....35,506.49

Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman:
 Edward C. Brooks, Jr., staff administrator.....7,828.31
 James McInnes Henderson, counsel (July 1-Aug. 15, 1960).....1,794.29
 John E. Moore, investigator.....6,014.78
 L. Russell Harding II, investigator.....4,646.49
 Irma Reel, clerk.....3,006.69
 Expenses.....1,777.28
 Total.....25,667.84

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman:
 James R. Naughton, counsel.....7,872.96
 Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member.....7,872.96
 Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer.....4,064.86
 Bebe B. Terry, clerk-stenographer.....3,653.05
 Expenses.....976.23
 Total.....24,440.06

Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. PORTER HARDY, Jr., chairman:
 John T. M. Reddan, chief counsel.....7,600.00
 Richard P. Bray, counsel.....7,515.63
 Walton Woods, investigator.....6,756.24
 Miles G. Romney, counsel.....6,398.90
 Phyllis Seymour, clerk.....4,064.86
 Yvonne J. Kurtak, stenographer.....3,447.11
 Expenses.....1,075.35
 Total.....36,858.09

Special Donable Property Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, chairman:
 Ray Ward, staff administrator.....8,185.65
 Margaret B. O'Connor, clerk-stenographer.....3,653.05
 Barbara McLaughlin, clerk-typist (July 1-Sept. 30, 1960).....1,028.94
 Clara K. Armstrong, minority clerk-stenographer.....3,668.48
 Expenses.....1,068.33
 Total.....17,594.45

Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman:
 Samuel J. Archibald, staff administrator.....8,185.65
 Jacob Seher, counsel.....4,354.97
 Harry S. Weidberg, assistant counsel.....5,742.30
 Jack Howard, professional staff member.....6,014.78
 Catherine Hartke, stenographer.....4,064.86
 Helen Beasley, stenographer.....4,064.86
 Expenses.....737.87
 Total.....33,165.29

Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman:
 Sidney McClellan, professional staff member.....6,559.70
 Francis J. Schwoerer, staff member (Dec. 22, 1960-Jan. 3, 1961).....333.37
 Martin McDonough, consultant.....936.87
 Edward P. Earley, consultant.....150.00
 Expenses.....3,962.28
 Total.....11,942.22

Special Subcommittee on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman:
 Expenses.....711.30
 Total.....711.30

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....1,040,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....701,670.38

Amount expended from July 1, 1960, to Jan. 3, 1961.....233,949.72

Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1959, to Jan. 3, 1961.....935,620.10

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1961.....104,379.90

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Chief clerk	\$8,824.74
Marjorie Savage	Assistant clerk	7,612.08
John F. Haley	do	6,294.00
Mary F. Stolle	do	3,896.94

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$20,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....18,062.88
Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 12, 1960.....742.31

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960.....18,805.19

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960.....1,194.81

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
Sidney L. McFarland	Engineering consultant and professional staff director	\$8,095.38
T. Richard Witmer	Counsel	7,787.82
John L. Taylor	Territorial and Indian consultant	7,787.82
Karl S. Landstrom	Minerals and lands consultant	7,787.82
Clerical staff:		
Nancy J. Arnold	Chief clerk	6,909.12
Laura A. Moran	Assistant chief clerk	4,555.14
Dixie S. Duncan	Clerk	3,745.02
Virginia E. Bedsole	do	3,522.24
Penelope P. Harvison	do	3,522.24
Marion Jo Gummelt	do	3,522.24

Paid from funds appropriated for committee expenses:

Paul D. Shriver, special consultant on territories, balance due under contract approved Feb. 22, 1960.....\$1,159.67

Stephen A. Langone, Indian affairs analyst, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, reimbursement for salary.....755.81

Edward J. Fanflik, special research assistant, paid under contract approved Nov. 29, 1960.....1,667.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....75,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....51,756.55
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960.....9,262.02

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960.....61,018.57

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960.....13,981.43

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1961.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson	Clerk	\$8,772.00
Kenneth J. Painter	Assistant clerk	7,322.10
Marcella Fend	Assistant clerk	4,575.42
Glenn L. Johnson	Printing editor	6,206.10
Joanne Neuland	Clerical assistant	3,643.80
Mildred H. Lang	do	3,643.80
Mary Ryan	do	3,643.80
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	3,593.16
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	8,772.00
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	8,772.00
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	8,772.00
Martin W. Cunningham	Aviation consultant	8,772.00
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 56 and H. Res. 136, amended:		
Gladys Johnson	Clerical assistant	3,542.52
Margaret J. Robinson	Staff assistant	7,796.64
Elsie M. Karpowich	Clerical assistant	3,643.80
Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight (to Jan. 3, 1961, inclusive):		
Robert W. Lishman	Chief counsel	8,918.22
Beverly M. Coleman	Principal attorney	8,199.05
Oliver Eastland	Attorney	8,199.05
Julius Eamet	do	7,761.29
Mary Louise Ramsey	do	7,515.61
Harold Ranstad	do	7,104.67
Charles P. Howze, Jr.	do	6,559.71
George Perry	do	5,773.54
Henry Hoye, Jr.	Attorney (to July 15, 1960)	416.73
William A. Brewer	Attorney	6,559.71
Stuart C. Ross	Consultant	8,199.05
Hugh M. Hall	Research specialist (to Sept. 30, 1960)	3,226.08
Raymond W. Martin	Special Assistant	4,476.64
Edward M. Jones	Investigator (to July 15, 1960)	537.68
Raymond C. Cole	Investigator	5,773.54
Lurline Wilbert	Executive secretary	4,512.67
Dolores E. Dougherty	File clerk-stenographer	3,930.99
Blanche Plant	Stenographer-clerk	3,601.56
Elizabeth Paola	do	3,601.56
Catherine McLees	do	3,601.56
Herman Clay Beasley	Chief clerk	7,283.34
Rex Sparger	Clerical assistant	5,192.61
Jean Mockbee	Clerical assistant (to Nov. 20, 1960)	2,137.00
Rowena Chinn	Clerical assistant (to July 15, 1960)	201.97
Pamela Caldwell	Clerical assistant	1,970.53
Jack Marshall Stark	Minority counsel	8,199.05
Mary Belle Osborn	Secretary to minority counsel	3,601.56

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$750,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....419,600.40
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960.....173,628.95

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960.....593,229.35

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960.....156,770.65

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1960.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry	Chief counsel	\$8,772.00
Bernard J. Zinke	Counsel	8,227.20
Robert H. Cowen	do	8,227.20
William B. Winfield	Chief clerk	7,612.08
Frances Still	Assistant clerk	5,030.16
Ruth E. Brookshire	do	3,998.22
Vera A. Barker	Secretary	3,998.22
Edith W. Gordon	do	3,998.22
E. M. Tollefson	Minority clerk	4,808.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$75,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....47,553.50
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960.....13,477.23

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960.....61,030.73

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960.....13,969.27

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1961.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frederick C. Belen	Chief counsel	\$8,824.74
Charles E. Johnson	Counsel	8,446.92
Bun Benton Bray, Jr.	Professional staff member	7,034.04
Clarence R. Jauchem	Professional staff member (2 months)	2,544.68
John H. Martiny	Attorney	7,216.68
John B. Price	Assistant clerk	4,504.50
Lillian L. Hopkins	do	4,403.28
Lucy K. Daley	do	4,200.72
Elsie E. Thornton	Secretary	3,795.66
Blanche M. Simons	do	3,339.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	52,513.62
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	16,188.39
Total amount expended from Jan. 29, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	68,702.01
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	6,297.99

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946," Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Margaret R. Belter	Staff director	\$8,824.74
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	8,824.74
Robert F. McConnell	Minority counsel	8,772.02
Joseph R. Brennan	Engineer-consultant	8,824.74
Stephen V. Feeley	Subcommittee clerk	6,294.00
Helen M. Dooley	Staff assistant	7,172.76
Helen A. Thompson	do	5,854.62
Dorothy A. Beam	do	5,204.16
S. Philip Cohen	do	4,504.50
Ester M. Saunders	Clerk-messenger	2,631.12
Investigating staff:		
Dunward G. Evans	Subcommittee clerk	4,909.56
John A. O'Connor, Jr.	do	4,909.56
William B. Short	do	4,909.56
Jerome N. Sonosky	do	4,909.56
Agnes M. GaNun	Staff assistant	3,876.66
Mary W. Porter	Minority staff assistant	3,968.42
Sterlyn B. Carroll	Clerk-messenger	2,631.12
Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program:		
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	8,824.74
Robert E. Manuel	Minority counsel	7,809.84
John P. Constandy	Assistant chief counsel	7,612.08
James J. Fitzpatrick	Associate counsel	6,996.96
Robert A. McElligott	do	6,996.96
Robert E. Vaughan	do	6,030.36
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	7,502.28
George M. Martin	Administrative assistant	7,243.02
Baron I. Shacklette	Investigator	6,996.96
James F. Kelly	do	6,469.74
John N. Dinsmore	do	6,346.74
Sherman S. Willse	do	6,030.36
Kathryn M. Keoney	Chief clerk	3,876.66
Mildred E. Rupert	Staff assistant	3,491.88
Jean N. Cameron	do	3,491.88
Eria S. Youmans	Minority staff assistant	3,339.96
Sara L. Vollett	Clerical assistant	2,818.50
Michael J. McInerney	Research assistant	2,702.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$475,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	188,007.52
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	183,331.14
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	371,338.66
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	103,661.33

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Carruthers, T. M.	Clerk	\$6,733.38
Forrest, Mary S.	Assistant clerk	4,200.72
Graves, Joan I.	Minority clerk	2,684.97

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles F. Ducander	Executive director and chief counsel	\$8,824.74
Charles S. Sheldon II.	Technical director	8,824.74
Philip B. Yeager	Special consultant	8,824.74
Spencer M. Beresford	Special counsel	8,824.74
Emily Dodson	Secretary	3,658.98
Eva F. Lopez	do	3,089.81
Jane J. Zetty	do	3,633.66
Mary Ann Robert	do	3,253.92
Mary L. Myron	do	3,122.28
Raymond Wilcove	Staff consultant	8,293.14
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk	8,293.14
C. Otis Finch	Assistant clerk	4,570.32
Richard P. Hines	Staff consultant	7,163.94
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	Counsel	7,269.42
Mary Ann Temple	Secretary	2,985.60
Emmie A. Walker	do	3,253.92
Mabel McLaughlin	Stenographer	828.11

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$300,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	140,173.27
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	66,599.27
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	206,772.54
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	93,227.46

OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved

August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Donald T. Appell	Investigator	\$7,260.60
Richard Arens	Staff director (resigned Aug. 31, 1960)	2,941.58
Juliette P. Joray	Recording clerk	5,678.88
Thelma S. Michalowski	Secretary to investigators	4,686.78
Isabel B. Nagel	Secretary to counsel	3,896.94
Rosella A. Purdy	Secretary to director	4,686.78
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.	Director	8,824.74
Anne D. Turner	Chief of reference section	5,722.80
Lorraine N. Veley	Secretary	3,694.44
William A. Wheeler	Investigator	7,084.86
Investigating committee:		
Beatrice P. Baldwin	Clerk-typist	2,681.76
Barbara Bannister	Clerk-typist (June 23 through Sept. 9, 1960)	923.87
Daniel Butler	Clerk-typist (appointed June 27, 1960)	2,220.45
Charlotte B. Carlson	Research analyst	3,213.42
Raymond T. Collins	Investigator	5,010.84
Regina Marie Crissy	Clerk-typist (June 27 through Sept. 9, 1960)	878.90
Annie Cunningham	Information analyst	3,719.70
Roslyn B. DuVal	do	2,691.84
Barbara H. Edelschein	Editor	3,188.10
Elizabeth L. Edinger	do	3,694.44
Emily R. Francis	Information analyst	2,479.26
Helen M. Gittings	Research analyst	4,605.78
Robert Henry Goldsborough	Investigator	3,238.74
Patricia R. Greeves	Research clerk (resigned Nov. 30, 1960)	1,880.40
Kathleen L. Hagenbuch	Secretary	3,559.40
Lillian E. Howard	Research analyst (resigned Oct. 31, 1960)	2,901.76
Walter B. Huber	Consultant	7,172.76
M. Patricia Kelley	Research analyst	2,965.32
Oliver M. King	Editor	4,453.86
Stephen V. Kopunek	Clerk of publications (resigned Oct. 31, 1960)	1,852.00
Fulton Lewis III	Research analyst	3,122.28
Gwendolyn L. Lewis	Administrative assistant	5,678.88
William Margetich	Investigator	3,562.80
Carolyn T. McGiffert	Clerk-typist (July 1 through Sept. 9, 1960)	833.93
Francis J. McNamara	Research consultant	6,567.64
Vincent Messina	Research analyst (appointed July 18, 1960)	2,153.39
Jane S. Muller	Information analyst	2,702.04
Alfred M. Nittle	Counsel (appointed Aug. 23, 1960)	4,978.77
Maureen P. Ontrich	Information analyst	3,026.10
Alma T. Pfaff	Research clerk	2,479.26
Katherine Phillips	Switchboard operator	2,555.22
Josephine S. Randolph	Research clerk	2,884.32
Louis J. Russell	Investigator	5,854.62
Hilda C. Schoenck	Secretary	1,475.40
Doris P. Shaw	Information analyst	2,702.04
Lela Mae Stiles	do	3,026.10
Joseph T. Timony	Clerk-typist	2,302.03
Consuelo Thompson	Secretary (appointed Oct. 5, 1960)	1,336.93
Geraldine M. Unangst	Clerk-stenographer	2,175.48
Mary Myers Valente	Secretary	2,798.22
John C. Walsh	Cocounsel	5,378.16
Vera L. Watts	Clerk-stenographer	3,431.10
Neil Wettermann	Investigator (appointed Dec. 5, 1960)	636.03
Billie Wheeler	Secretary	1,984.26
Regina M. Wilt	Clerk-typist	2,127.14

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$654,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	439,790.46
Amount expended from July 1, 1960, to Jan. 3, 1961.....	176,331.32
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1959, to Jan. 3, 1961.....	616,121.78
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1961.....	37,878.22

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Oliver E. Meadows.....	Staff director (P).....	\$8,824.74
Edwin B. Patterson.....	Counsel (P).....	8,824.74
Harold A. L. Lawrence.....	Professional aid to minority (P).....	8,089.34
J. Buford Jenkins.....	Professional aid (P).....	7,699.98
George W. Fisher.....	Clerk.....	8,824.74
Ida Rowan.....	Administrative aid (minority).....	8,051.46
Paul K. Jones.....	Assistant clerk.....	6,294.00
Helen A. Biondi.....	do.....	5,160.66
Alice V. Matthews.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	4,302.00
George J. Turner.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,302.00
Investigative staff:		
Adin M. Downer.....	Staff member.....	6,720.18
Mark L. Davis.....	Clerk-messenger.....	905.04
Joanne Doyle.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	3,496.98
Jean Johnson.....	do.....	1,748.49
Audrey June Lyle.....	Secretary.....	1,452.27
Paul H. Smiley.....	Investigator.....	3,980.76
John Billie Smith.....	do.....	5,397.48
Glyndon M. Hague, Jr.....	do.....	5,338.81
Margaret J. Bales.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	1,847.22
Billy E. Kirby.....	Investigator.....	3,554.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$160,000.00
--	--------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	83,453.97
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960.....	46,432.01

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960.....	129,885.98
--	------------

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960.....	30,114.02
---	-----------

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee:		
Leo H. Irwin.....	Chief counsel (C).....	\$8,824.74
Thomas A. Martin.....	Minority counsel (P).....	8,824.74
John M. Martin, Jr.....	Assistant chief counsel (P).....	8,666.58
Gerard M. Brannon.....	Professional assistant (P).....	8,666.58
Raymond F. Conkling.....	do.....	7,638.48
Alfred R. McCauley.....	Professional assistant (P) (from Dec. 10, 1960).....	951.94
Virginia Baker.....	Staff assistant (C).....	4,276.68
Virginia Butler.....	do.....	4,383.00
Frances E. Donovan.....	do.....	4,276.68
Grace Kagan.....	do.....	4,383.00
June Kendall.....	do.....	4,453.86
Margaretta G. Pestell.....	do.....	3,375.42
Elizabeth L. Ruth.....	do.....	4,150.08
Susan Taylor.....	do.....	5,300.82
Irene Wade.....	do.....	4,383.00
Hughlon Greene.....	Document clerk.....	2,894.40
Walter B. Little.....	do.....	2,894.40
Expenses.....		2,123.52
Subcommittee on Administration of Foreign Trade Laws and Policy, Hon. HALE BOOGS (Democrat, Louisiana), chairman:		
Mildred Atkins.....	Staff assistant (C).....	3,755.16
Myer Rashish.....	Economist.....	7,984.10
Expenses.....		97.25
Total.....		11,836.51
Subcommittee on Administration of Internal Revenue Laws, Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS (Democrat, Arkansas), chairman:		
Sybil D. Burd.....	Staff assistant (C).....	4,276.68
Frances Russell.....	do.....	5,527.98
Eileen Sonnett.....	do.....	3,289.38
William E. Wells.....	do.....	2,702.04
Expenses.....		1.50
Total.....		15,797.58
Subcommittee on Administration of Social Security Laws, Hon. BURT P. HARRISON (Democrat, Virginia), chairman:		
Jacqueline McKenna.....	Staff assistant (C) (to Oct. 10, 1960).....	1,827.39
Expenses.....		28.28
Total.....		1,855.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$300,000.00
--	--------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	106,341.45
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960.....	31,613.28

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960.....	137,954.73
--	------------

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960.....	162,045.27
---	------------

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1961.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bryan H. Jacques.....	Staff director.....	\$8,754.45
Everette MacIntyre.....	General counsel.....	8,754.45
William Summers Johnson.....	Chief economist.....	8,051.47
Victor P. Dalmas.....	Adviser to minority members.....	8,051.47
Irving Maness.....	Assistant counsel.....	8,051.47
Justinus Gould.....	do.....	7,216.67
Richard L. Mitchell.....	do.....	6,557.62
W. N. Peach.....	Special consultant.....	4,377.24
Frederick A. Spinelli.....	Assistant counsel.....	5,378.14
Philip C. Newman.....	Staff economist.....	1,450.29
John Bryan.....	Business analyst.....	3,871.63
Brooks Robertson.....	Analyst.....	5,378.14
Charles F. Peake.....	Economist.....	1,806.76
Marie M. Stewart.....	Clerk.....	4,418.45
Jane M. Deem.....	Administrative assistant.....	4,418.45
James M. Lyday.....	Economist.....	305.92
Katherine C. Blackburn.....	Research analyst.....	4,048.83
Margaret Fallon Palmer.....	do.....	3,896.94
Geraldine Louise Leshin.....	do.....	1,012.21
Robert Rota.....	Investigator.....	2,955.19
Carolyn A. Latimer.....	Research analyst.....	674.81
Helen E. Steady.....	Secretary for the minority.....	400.60
Dorothy F. Council.....	Stenographer.....	3,674.16
Bessie C. Harding.....	do.....	3,674.16
Barbara W. McConnell.....	do.....	3,289.38
Olga E. Schreiber.....	do.....	3,228.59
Anna A. Holovach.....	Secretary-stenographer.....	1,022.39
Frances C. Crane.....	do.....	3,228.59
Jean Williams Fender.....	Stenographer.....	2,823.54
Margaret C. Staleup.....	do.....	1,864.52
Marcia G. Rucker.....	do.....	2,691.86
Jo Ann Jeffries.....	do.....	2,109.51

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$520,000.00
--	--------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	337,233.20
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960.....	139,820.39

Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960.....	477,053.59
--	------------

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960.....	42,946.41
---	-----------

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 25, 1961.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1960

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from August 1 to January 3, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Gillis W. Long.....	Chief counsel.....	\$7,000.00
Richard O. O'Hare.....	Counsel.....	4,000.00
Robert F. Nunez.....	do.....	4,500.00
Robert S. Smith.....	do.....	950.00
Ruth M. Heritage.....	Clerk.....	5,573.99
Elizabeth H. Feltman.....	Secretary.....	1,401.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	None
Amount expended from Aug. 1, 1960, to Jan. 3, 1961.....	27,228.40
Total amount expended from Aug. 1, 1960, to Jan. 3, 1961.....	27,228.40
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1961.....	7,771.60

CLIFFORD DAVIS,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

571. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "a bill to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

572. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities relating to providing aviation war risk insurance as of December 31, 1960, pursuant to title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

573. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules and regulations with respect to community antenna television systems"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

574. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$33 million for the Department of Labor, a proposed increase in limitation in the amount of \$10 million for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and a reduction of \$12 million in a proposed supplemental appropriation for the Post Office Department, all for the fiscal year 1961 (H. Doc. No. 91); and ordered to be printed; to the Committee on Appropriations.

575. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for "Education and welfare services," for the fiscal year 1961, has been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

576. A letter from the Director, Office of Administrative Operations, U.S. Department of Commerce, transmitting a report of foreign excess property disposed of during calendar year 1959 by the U.S. Department of Commerce, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 4502. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to make it unlawful for the licensee of any radio or television broadcasting station to consistently or systematically portray, in the programs broadcast by such station, any religious group, race, or nationality in a degrading or criminal manner; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 4503. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING (by request):

H.R. 4504. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 4505. A bill to provide that States and political subdivisions which operate liquor stores shall not be required to pay more than one tax as a retail dealer in liquor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4506. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway from a point near Moorcroft, Wyo., to a point on the Canadian boundary near the city of Raymond, Mont., as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4507. A bill vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Surabachi, Iwo Jima Volcanic Islands, Pacific Ocean area; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4508. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at Bushy Run Battlefield Park in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 4509. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 4510. A bill to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARLAND:

H.R. 4511. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 4512. A bill to amend section 405(a) of the National Housing Act to increase to \$20,000 the maximum insurance with respect to any member or investor of a savings and loan association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 4513. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the county of De Soto, State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. INOUE:

H.R. 4514. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated annually to carry out the program for the conservation and restoration of the Hawaiian Nene goose, and to extend such program for an additional 5 years; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4515. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to make certain benefits under that act available to teachers in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4516. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to permit laboratory schools operated by public institutions of higher education to participate in certain programs under that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 4517. A bill to extend and increase the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 4518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax presently imposed on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4519. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4520. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4521. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the maximum benefits which may be paid thereunder for any month on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of an insured individual where such individual has a disabled child over age 18 entitled to child's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4522. A bill to amend section 902(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit for foreign taxes paid by a foreign corporation 20 percent or more of the voting stock of which is owned by another foreign corporation in which a domestic corporation has a substantial stock interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4523. A bill to amend section 4242 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the club dues tax certain charges made by nonprofit clubs for the use of facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4524. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam shall each be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 4525. A bill to require the Postmaster General to adjust the compensation of star route, panel body, and mail messenger contractors, by reason of added costs imposed upon them by statute, and to modernize the law relating to contracts for the transportation of mail and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4526. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion of certain additional types of compensation within the meaning of the term "basic salary" for the purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4527. A bill to extend to employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949 the benefits of salary increases in connection with the protection of basic compensation rates from the effects of downgrading actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 4528. A bill for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTROYA:

H.R. 4529. A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purposes of Congress in enacting the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes approved October 15, 1914, as

amended (U.S.C. title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes," and to clarify the intent and meaning of the aforesaid law by providing for the mandatory nature of functional discounts under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 4530. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to make the educational benefits provided for therein available to all veterans whether or not they serve during a period of war or of armed hostilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4531. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4532. A bill to relieve hardship for displaced families and businesses by assisting in their relocation and by providing them with mortgage financing under a new low-rent private housing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 4533. A bill to provide for the establishment of an effective Federal aid program to assist States in the development of certain outdoor recreational resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4534. A bill to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4535. A bill to grant a deduction, for income tax purposes, to handicapped individuals, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer supporting dependents who are so handicapped as to be unable to care for themselves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 4536. A bill to extend and increase the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4537. A bill to amend chapter 71 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that in determining eligibility of a member of an armed force for retirement, the Secretary concerned shall credit service performed before the attainment of 18 years of age; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4538. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1958 with respect to certain reservoir projects in Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4539. A bill to amend section 723 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for immediate payment of dividends on insurance heretofore issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 which has been converted or exchanged for new insurance under such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 4540. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4541. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Federal payments for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled shall be \$50 per recipient per month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4542. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove the limitations on the amount of medical and dental expenses which may be deducted, to permit taxpayers to deduct such expenses, to arrive at their adjusted gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4543. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other educational expenses paid by him, whether for his own education or for the education of his spouse or a dependent or any other individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4544. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4545. A bill to amend section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of certain educational leave allowances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4546. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 4547. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4548. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1930, in order to increase the authorization for funds for the extension of certain projects from the District of Columbia into the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.J. Res. 242. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.J. Res. 243. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.J. Res. 244. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.J. Res. 245. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. Con. Res. 164. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KYL:

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution to clarify the intent of Congress regarding the extension of rural mail deliveries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 172. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should call a White House Conference on Highway Safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. Res. 173. Resolution to amend rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. Res. 174. Resolution to amend rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to being opposed to the dedication of additional lands as primitive or wilderness areas in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 4549. A bill for the relief of Susumu Mori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 4550. A bill for the relief of Shafiq (Shalom) Kassab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4551. A bill for the relief of Delio D'Alfonso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 4552. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Paca; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 4553. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Ryba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4554. A bill for the relief of Annunziata Sabatini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4555. A bill for the relief of Miss Giuliana Vardeu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4556. A bill for the relief of Edward Gruszka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 4557. A bill for the relief of Manuel Martinez-Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 4558. A bill for the relief of Otis D. Shreve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4559. A bill for the relief of Francisco Silveira Machado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 4560. A bill for the relief of the estate of Walter Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4561. A bill for the relief of Jack Mishanleh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 4562. A bill for the relief of Flora T. Lomboy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4563. A bill for the relief of Abraham Gelb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 4564. A bill for the relief of Matheos Matheopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H.R. 4565. A bill for the relief of Nora M. Hammond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 4566. A bill for the relief of Vincenzina Ciavattini Restuccia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 4567. A bill for the relief of John Korenda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4568. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. and Mrs. James H. McIntosh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Millard E. Tydings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, courage is a precious commodity in this world. But there are some precious few to whom the Creator of us all has, in His wisdom, allotted the courage of 10. Millard E. Tydings was such a man, and the State of Maryland and the United States of America are diminished by his passing.

It was courage that drew him as a young man into local politics and it was that courage combined with outstanding ability that enabled him to win in the face of great obstacles. Another man might have been content to enjoy in peace the fruits of political victory, but not Millard Tydings. A stronger trumpet blew in his ears, sounding the call to arms and the defense of his country.

With such a man there could be but one answer to that trumpet call. Even before World War I he served in the Mexican border campaign. He entered the Army a private, served in the World War, and 3 years later emerged a lieutenant colonel. He was awarded a Distinguished Service Medal, a Distinguished Service Cross, and three citations.

His foreign wars fought, he returned to political combat. He was elected to the Maryland house of delegates, where he served ably as speaker, and then to the State senate. In 1924 he was sent to the House of Representatives. And 2 years later the free State proudly elected him, at the age of 36, to the U.S. Senate.

Senators who served with Mr. Tydings have eloquently testified to the magnificent work he performed during his 24 years' service in the Senate. As chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee he was acknowledged to be one of this country's experts on military affairs. He also served on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. In all his duties he was conscientious, willing, courageous and intelligent, so that his reputation spread throughout the land, and over the seas as well. On learning of Senator Tydings' death, the President of the Philippines expressed his country's gratitude to the man who coauthored the measure providing for Philippine independence in 1946.

It was courage again that persuaded the Senator to oppose President Roosevelt's Supreme Court plan in 1937. It was courage that drove him to stand up against hysteria and vilification whatever the political cost. If the lives of great men are their monuments, Millard E. Tydings' monument will tower over our land until the end of time.

Last Tribute to a Great Statesman— Millard E. Tydings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, recently one of Maryland's beloved and respected sons passed from our midst. Formerly a Member of this body, he later gained national renown as a U.S. Senator.

I am sure that you all know that I speak of Millard E. Tydings.

It is not necessary for me to recite his life history, though inspirational in itself; and indeed it lends itself to book form. Rather, I would prefer to pay tribute to Millard Tydings, the personality. Men are not often cast in the mold from which he was made. His was an independence and strength of character which could only evoke admiration and emulation.

During one of his early campaigns for election, Millard Tydings said: "If I am elected, I shall vote for those measures I believe to be right and oppose those I believe to be wrong, no matter who advocates or opposes them, and when I can no longer do that I care no longer to represent this State in any public body."

Many high-sounding statements and promises are made during political campaigns, only to be lost sight of in the dazzling brilliance of victory. But Millard Tydings never lost sight of that statement. He never forgot it. He lived by it.

Even when he stood alone, being attacked from all sides, condemned and vilified, he never flinched, because he believed that what he was doing was right. And time has proven him so. Though you may not have always agreed with him, you had to respect him.

Millard E. Tydings has carved for himself a respected place in the history of our country and he will be long remembered and sorely missed by his fellow Marylanders. I believe that no

more appropriate epitaph could be found for this courageous man than those words he lived by:

"I shall vote for those measures I believe to be right and oppose those I believe to be wrong, no matter who advocates or opposes them."

Lifting Ban on Russian Canned Crab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the Russian political offensive to spread its Communist ideology and control throughout the world is being matched by its economic offensive which is becoming of increasing concern to all of us. From its rapid construction of vast hydroelectric projects and reportedly accelerated gold mining to increase the monetary impact of the ruble, to intensive exploration and exploitation of the resources of the seven seas, the Russians are forging ahead.

In speaking of the resources of the ocean I refer to a subject which has come uncomfortably close to home. Because the Russians have for 2 years now operated a massive trawling fleet in the Bering Sea, capturing bottom fish on a large scale, which they have a right to do in the international waters involved, those of us interested in the great wealth of the North Pacific fisheries have developed a mounting and frustrating concern. This concern became enhanced when the Russians last year expanded their activities to the taking of king crab from the Bering Sea and processing the crabmeat on mother ships. Russian ocean exploration was also expanded. The Russians have now stated that their next move will be exploration of the Gulf of Alaska, the site of halibut banks long fished almost exclusively by United States and Canadian fishermen.

It has been bad enough to watch these developments backed by the Russian Government as against the feeble efforts of privately owned and operated fishing vessels of the United States, but the worst recent development is the declared intention of the Department of the Treasury to lift the ban on Russian canned crabmeat. This ban was effectuated 10 years ago because Russian-caught crab was being canned by

convict labor. Now that this practice has been reportedly discontinued, the Treasury Department is all set to lift the ban. Presumably, of course, the consideration for such a step was weighed against the impact upon our own crabmeat industry which produces about 29 percent of crabmeat consumed in the United States. Perhaps also our own producers, who are expanding their crabmeat enterprises, can be protected by realistic quotas, but on this score I have been given no assurance whatsoever. Even if such assurance were given, I feel that this latest concession to Russia is not warranted, if only for the following reason: The North Pacific Fisheries Convention between the United States, Canada, and Japan will expire in 2 years. Under this convention the Japanese have limited their high seas salmon fishery to an area of the North Pacific west of a provisional line set at 175 degrees west longitude. Through tagging and other research, it has been determined that many salmon caught by the Japanese in their presently prescribed area are spawned in Alaskan streams. It has also been established that many are spawned in Russian streams and that the Japanese North Pacific fishery has a considerable impact upon the Russian coastal salmon fishery as great, if not greater, than the impact of such Japanese fishing upon Alaska's Bristol Bay red salmon runs. It is my considered opinion that about 2 years hence, when United States negotiators will be working with the Japanese toward revision and extension of the North Pacific Fishery Convention, they will have to reckon with the Russians one way or the other and that a reappraisal of the whole subject will have to be brought to bear. Therefore, I strongly oppose the Treasury Department's proposal to lift the ban on Russian-caught crabmeat at this time, which will not only encourage Russian exploitation of the great king crab resource of the Bering Sea off the coast of Alaska, but weaken the bargaining position of the United States in the approaching clash of interests with the Russians in regard to the utilization and conservation of the fisheries of the North Pacific.

Gen. Isaac David White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. INOUE. Mr. Speaker, America's top soldier in the Pacific theater, 59-year-old Gen. I. D. White, announced on January 29, 1961, that he currently planned to retire on April 1, 1961, after more than 38 years of active military service.

As commander in chief, U.S. Army, Pacific, General White heads the largest geographical U.S. Army command in the world, covering some 12 million square

miles of land area, embracing 21 countries, and comprised of 5 major subordinate commands where U.S. troops are stationed in Korea, Japan, Okinawa, Taiwan, and Hawaii.

General White's Army career began in 1923 when he was commissioned a second lieutenant of cavalry. In the days when cavalry meant horses, he served successively with the 14th, 3d, and 7th Cavalry Regiments. He became an expert rider, played on Army polo teams, and as recently as 1948 managed the Army's equestrian team that competed in the world Olympic games in London. While on his first assignment with the 14th Cavalry at Fort Des Moines, Iowa, he first met and in 1928 married Miss Julia Eleanor Cotton, his constant partner these past 31 years.

Though first making his mark as a "horse soldier," he really won his spurs in the mechanized cavalry as a tank commander. He was among the vanguard of farsighted officers who in the early 1930's pioneered the transition from horses to armor.

He was assigned to the 2d Armored Division being organized at Fort Benning, Ga., in 1940, with the rank of major, and remained with that division throughout World War II, participating in eight major campaigns in Africa, Sicily, and Europe. Before the war's end, he had served the 2d Armored Division in every grade from major to major general, and was division commander when the "hell on wheels" division gained the distinction of being the first American force to reach and cross the Elbe River in Germany.

Between World War II and the Korean conflict, General White had three major assignments. He headed the Cavalry School (later, the Ground General School) at Fort Riley, Kans.; commanded the crack U.S. Constabulary in Germany for 3 years where he developed it into a hard hitting armored fighting force; and returned to become commanding general of the Armored Center and commandant of the Armored School at Fort Knox, Ky.

While head of the two service schools, General White revised the curriculums in the light of World War II experience and the advent of nuclear weapons, and was instrumental in effecting the reorganization of American Armor into its present pentomic concept. In Europe he set up a Noncommissioned Officers Academy for the Constabulary which became a model for similar schools throughout the armed services; sponsored the first of the Army's NCO Advisory Councils; and created a tank training center at Vilseck, Germany, which has become a model for Armor training around the world.

General White has spent 7 of the past 9 years in the Pacific area. He first went to Korea in 1952 to command the X Corps through three mountain campaigns, directed the training of four Republic of Korea Army divisions and the organization of a ROK corps headquarters. For outstanding success in these assignments, General White was awarded an oak leaf cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal and the Korean Order of

Military Merit Taeguk. President Rhee, in presenting the Korean award, stated:

General White, with brilliant tactical perception, coordinated the deployment of 8th Army and Republic of Korea Army units in a manner which abruptly halted the onslaught of the enemy and subsequently forced their disorderly retreat.

After the Korean truce, General White returned to command the 4th U.S. Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., and in 1955 again crossed the Pacific, this time as a four-star general, to command Army Forces Far East and 8th U.S. Army.

When the U.S. military forces in the Pacific and Far East were reorganized in 1957, he moved to Fort Shafter to begin his present assignment, as first commander in chief of the greatly expanded U.S. Army Pacific and the first four-star general to serve in Hawaii. In the past 3 years he has logged well over 1,800 flying hours and covered almost a half of a million miles in visiting the various elements of his farflung command.

General White holds 12 U.S. and 14 foreign decorations. His alma mater, Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., has awarded him a master of military science degree and an honorary doctorate of laws, and the University of Maryland recognized his achievements with the degree of doctor of military science.

He has the unique distinction among general officers in the Army today of having spent almost his entire career as a troop commander—compiling an impressive record of tactical command from platoon leader to theater Army commander.

General White is the last officer on active duty of that distinguished group, including Generals Van Voorhis, Chafee, Patton, and Scott, which played such a key role in developing the fledgling armored force into the most powerful armored formations ever employed in combat.

During the past 6 years in the Far East and Hawaii, General White recognized and became keenly aware of the increasing interdependence of political, economic, cultural, and military efforts to the overall objectives of the free democratic peoples of the world. He constituted his staff so as to be continually advised of the trends of the governments in his field of interest, and throughout the world, and evaluated the changing political and economic postures of the nations of the Far East and southeast Asia in the light of their military requirements. He was unique in laying great stress on the value of mutual understanding and good will within the areas wherein his troops were positioned. His activities in this respect have been noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by resolutions of the House and Senate of the State of Hawaii, and by numerous personal commendations. He conceived, implemented, and developed brotherhood programs among the various ethnic groups in Hawaii with the peoples of the lands of their ancestors in the Far East. His programs, as an East-West concept, have done much to create and further the now existing good relationships with

the peoples of the countries within the USARPAC area of responsibilities.

His wide, personal acquaintanceship with heads of state, as well as the military leaders of the Far East and south-east Asia, and his untiring efforts in the all encompassing fields of political, economic, cultural, and military endeavors mark him as an outstanding soldier-diplomat in the truest sense of the word.

The people of Hawaii are saddened over the retirement of this outstanding soldier-diplomat. However, we are joyous over his decision to reside in Honolulu, Hawaii. We extend to him our fondest aloha.

Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think it safe to assume that when the name of Christopher Columbus is mentioned most of us have a fairly clear idea of the identity of the individual referred to. But I am bold enough to hazard the guess that when we refer to the official name of our country, the United States of America, some of us might be a little vague concerning the derivation of the last word, as applied to the two western continents. At any rate, I feel it will do no harm to refresh our memories as to why we are called the United States of America and hence are Americans and not Columbians.

Amerigo Vespucci was born, probably on March 9, 1451, or 1452, the son of a Florentine notary. A clerk in the commercial office of the Medici, the great banking family of Florence, Vespucci seems generally to have resided in Spain, especially in Cadiz and Seville, no doubt as an agent of the Medici. It is recorded that he acquired "an excellent practical knowledge of astronomy" and was the greatest expert of his day in the calculation of latitude and longitude, and made an avocation of geography and the collection of globes, charts, and maps. As contractor to the Spanish crown for the fitting out of vessels, it is probable that Vespucci participated in the organization of Columbus' second voyage in 1493.

Our knowledge of Vespucci's voyages are based on his own letters, which are sketchy and generally believed to be unreliable, as they are in part contradictory. All the originals have been lost. Despite his reputation as the greatest expert of his day in the calculation of latitude and longitude, his accounts of all of his four voyages to the New World, beginning with the first one in 1497, are hopelessly confused and there is no telling just what landfalls he made. His letters, it should be added, are cursory and informal and not in the nature of official reports. In a letter written probably to one Pietro Soderini, chief magistrate of Florence, dated Septem-

ber 4, 1504, he gives an account of the four voyages he says he made; in the first, that of 1497, he says that after running to the Canaries, the expedition made land 1,000 leagues to the south-westward from those islands and then proceeded to coast for 870 leagues along a shore so extensive that it was thought to be a continent; passed 37 days in a fine harbor and then returned to Spain. It has been surmised that Vespucci possibly might have sailed from Cape Honduras to a point not far from Cape Canaveral, Fla. If this is so, then he did indeed touch the continent which, however, like Columbus a year later, he thought to be that of Asia.

From this letter, supposedly to the Florentine magistrate, of which four printed copies exist, without place or date, but probably written before 1507, a French version was made, and from this one in Latin, printed in Lorraine in April 1507, which was immediately made use of by Martin Waldseemüller, professor of cosmography in St. Dié University. Because in some of the earlier reprints of Vespucci's letters the title, or introduction, bore the words "Mundus Novus"—New World, Waldseemüller made the first suggestion in a printed book that the newly discovered fourth part of the world "should be called America, because Americus discovered it."

But this is by no means certain; in fact, since Alexander von Humboldt, founder of the science of physical geography (for whom the Humboldt Current is named) published his great work in 1837, scientific and scholarly opinion has generally inclined to the belief, according to Sir Charles Raymond Beazley, contributor to the article on Vespucci in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, that the Florentine had no part at all in the discovery of the continents and the isthmus which now bear his name.

Be that as it may, our Republic remains the United States of America—and may the name long figure on the maps and in the histories of this, our world.

We Must Take Prompt Action on the President's Minimum Wage Increase Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the following is a copy of my statement to the House Committee on Education and Labor on the important subject of minimum wage increase:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Education and Labor, your committee has before it for consideration today H.R. 3935, which embodies the administration's wage-hour proposals. The amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act would lift the minimum wage to \$1.25 hourly in three annual installments. Another chief purpose would be to extend the coverage of

the act to 4.3 million additional workers. I am pleased that in addition to other important changes, the bill would provide a three-step increase in existing wage orders in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

I wish to express my hearty support of this bill, to which President Kennedy has requested Congress to give prompt consideration. On January 3, 1961, I reintroduced my bill to increase the minimum hourly wage to \$1.25, for the millions of underpaid workers in our country have needed this assistance for a long time.

Lengthy hearings and debate on amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act during the 86th Congress proved the merits of the legislation now before you and pointed up the hardships of underpaid workers and those not now receiving protection under the law, who can barely exist on their low earnings and whose living conditions are woefully substandard. We know that wage increases have not been commensurate with skyrocketing living costs—the Consumer Price Index has reached an alltime high. I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, that you have indicated that extensive hearings on this subject will not be necessary now.

The bill under consideration is moderate and the proposed benefits are the very least we should provide at this time.

I urge your committee to take favorable action without delay, and I trust that the Congress will pass this important bill at its earliest opportunity.

Alaska and New Federal Judgeships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement, which I submitted last week to Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in support of H.R. 2226, the so-called omnibus judgeship bill, to provide for the appointment of 63 additional district court judges. This statement highlighted the need for an additional district court judge for the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. RALPH J. RIVERS, OF ALASKA, ON MARCH 1, 1961, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON H.R. 2226

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of being heard on the matter of H.R. 2226, the so-called omnibus judgeship bill, to provide for the appointment of 9 additional circuit court judges and 63 additional district court judges. I speak in support of this measure, but shall confine my comments to the need for an additional district court judge for Alaska, as is provided for in this bill.

The U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska came into existence on February 20, 1960, pursuant to Alaska's becoming a State. Prior to that time, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, which was composed of four divisions, served as the only judicial establishment in Alaska. According to a report prepared by the Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, 3,048 civil cases were pending on the date that the district court

for the territory ceased to exist. As might be expected, a large percentage of these cases were of a local nature and as a result were transferred to the new State courts. The remainder, totaling 214 civil cases, were transferred to the newly created U.S. district court. Between February 20, 1960, and December 31, 1960, a total of 101 cases were commenced and a total of 111 cases were terminated by the court. Therefore, at the start of 1961, a total of 204 civil cases were still pending before the court. To be sure, this figure is below the national average of backlogged cases pending before other U.S. district courts, and might not be considered impressive except for the unusual conditions prevailing in Alaska.

To vividly illustrate these unusual conditions I would like to quote several paragraphs from the statement of the Honorable Walter H. Hodge, U.S. district judge for the District of Alaska, before the Committee on Court Administration of the Judicial Conference of the United States, at Seattle, Wash., August 16, 1960. At that time, Judge Hodge stated:

"First there was the problem of the very considerable backlog which faced the former U.S. district court at the time of the transition. At this time there was pending in the third division at Anchorage some 2,200 cases and in the fourth division at Fairbanks some 900 cases. The criminal cases had been kept fairly current but the civil cases were far behind, having been pending between the date of issue and possible date of trial for as long as 5 years and a great majority of them over 3 years.

"Facing this problem we attempted first to hold pretrial conferences in all civil cases throughout the circuit so far as we could reach them, covering the cases pending at Anchorage up through 1957 and those at Fairbanks through 1958. We were amazed to find that out of 54 such conferences held only 2 cases were immediately disposed of, one by confession of judgment and the other by order of the court, which of course is far below the national average.

"Travel involved is the next most serious problem. Alaska is by far the largest district in the Union, being approximately 2½ times the size of the State of Texas. The distance between Ketchikan, farthest point southeast where the judge is required to hold court, and Nome, the farthest point northwest, is slightly over 1,300 air miles. More appropriately, the distance from our headquarters at Anchorage to the four places where we are required to hold court, as given by the airlines, is as follows: Ketchikan, 768 miles; Juneau, 578 miles; Fairbanks, 263 miles; and Nome, 535 miles.

"The cost of travel is also significant, where we find that our cost as extending through September 30, 1960, is \$10,839. These costs would not be eliminated by the addition of a second judge but would be substantially reduced. In this connection we find it necessary to take with us our clerk or deputy clerk as an in-court deputy for the reason that at the four places other than Anchorage we have the assistance of the State superior court clerks who also serve as deputy clerks of our court without compensation, and we find that we cannot justly require them to appear in court. We also need the services of a reporter, my secretary, and a law clerk, whose services I find invaluable in doing research work.

"It is my firm belief that the task cannot be adequately accomplished by one judge. I am not thinking so much of the burden upon the judge as the burden upon litigants who have been so long awaiting disposition of their cases."

By now, I have the latest figure showing that by December 31, 1960, the total cost for travel, including subsistence expenses, has risen to \$18,859.13. Furthermore, the travel by air has frequently been delayed

by bad weather, resulting in delays in court schedules, and increased travel expenses. It should also be mentioned that Alaska is growing rapidly so that the volume of business will increase apace.

Inasmuch as the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska is not as yet a year old, no record of cases filed or terminated, or of the time required to dispose of cases covering a full year has been compiled. However, attached to this prepared statement is a copy of the statistical study and general information summary prepared by Judge Hodge covering the first three quarters of operation of the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska. These statistics demonstrate the need for an additional district judge.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize that the existence of the need for additional judgeships throughout the United States in the Federal courts, both district and appellate, has been amply proven and documented both in the records of previous congressional hearings and in the press of the Nation. We all know that the existence of court congestion and consequent delay in the disposition of cases causes serious hardship to the litigants. It also places heavy burdens on the judges so serious in nature as to impede the efficient performance of judicial functions. This is so in Alaska and in every other Federal district. Therefore, I respectfully urge that the committee report H.R. 2226.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee.

Statement Supporting Adequate Funds for House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have ever requested an opportunity to appear in person before the Committee on House Administration in support of a committee obtaining funds necessary to carry out its jurisdictional responsibilities.

Also it may be somewhat unusual for someone like myself to actively support a committee's request for adequate funds when, as in this instance, the person is not a member of that committee.

There are several reasons why I support investigations and so forth of un-American propaganda activities and the obtaining of information about subversive propaganda attacking our constitutional form of government.

First, let me explain that I strongly support the purposes for which the Committee on Un-American Activities was established in 1945.

Second, I believe the record of the accomplishments of this committee is such as to fully justify its continuance.

Third, I am convinced that it is important at this time, as I shall explain hereinafter, for the American people and especially its youth to learn the goals, methods and treachery of imperialistic communism and to dedicate their opposition to the spread of Communist ideology.

Fourth, I am disturbed at recent statements minimizing the achievements of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I oppose the move to reduce its effectiveness by curtailing its funds. Furthermore, I feel it proper, since the recent vote to continue the committee was unanimous, without one single dissenting vote, for the House to recognize its moral obligation to provide necessary funds for its work.

Fifth, I have had occasions to call on this committee for printed material and information to meet the requests of my constituents. The chairman of the committee and staff have been extremely helpful.

Sixth, from firsthand knowledge I know the workload of the committee is heavy. I understand there was a 27-percent increase in inquiries in 1960 over the previous years. I noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about a month ago, in a Senate report on Senate Resolution 49, that the Senate committee to service the needs of 100 Members of the other body as reflected by the Senate resolution for funds was \$300,000. If the 437 Members of the House call on our committee to the extent I do, I do not quite see how \$331,000 which I understand the House committee has asked would be adequate.

In urging adequate funds, I want to say that I think the constituents whom I have the honor to represent are not for unnecessary expenditures. They are strongly against waste and unneeded expenditure of their tax money. In 1959, I received 33,000 signatures on a petition to reduce Government expenses, and thousands of letters, too. Nevertheless the people of the First Congressional District of Washington State are strongly against curtailment of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I sent out 30,000 questionnaires last April. In it I asked the question: "Do you believe the House of Representatives should continue the Un-American Activities Committee?" A tabulation of replies showed 3,652 or 83.4 percent in favor of continuation; and only 728 or 16.6 percent against continuation.

However, Mr. Speaker, something has occurred which has kindled anew public interest in seeing the committee continue its function. I have been deluged with hundreds and hundreds of individually written letters and postal cards supporting the committee.

This surge of mail followed FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's recent warning regarding a drive to form a new Socialist-oriented youth group. Mr. Hoover called it a "sinister and determined movement to communize the college campuses of the United States." He added, "While parading as a movement to popularize progressive ideas among youth, it is in back a coldly calculated Communist maneuver to envelop thousands of unsuspecting young Americans into the subversive fold."

In connection with the drive to establish Marxist youth groups on American campuses, I refer to an article by Edward J. Mowery which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger on January 29, 1961. It was entitled "Reds Setting Up Cells on

College Campuses" and described demonstrations in various colleges including a youth rally in my congressional district.

I quote now from this newspaper article:

Emboldened by student demonstrations here and abroad, the drive to enlist unwary students has two immediate aims.

To establish a Communist Party youth front in lieu of the ill-fated Labor Youth League and American Youth for Democracy.

To have on instant call an organized student group for tactics of incitation, disruption, and agitation.

"This is not a casual Red-sponsored youth maneuver," one official declared. "The movement is gaining momentum from Portland, Oreg., to Madison, Wis., and it's deadly. These people are seeking recruits even among theological students."

The campaign with little fanfare last March 7 when Mortimer Daniel Rubin toured college campuses in the South.

He appeared before southern student groups as a youth leader. (He is national youth director of the Communist Party.) And he solicited the support of white students for sit-in demonstrations.

On March 28 at the University of Wisconsin, Rubin relinquished the main speaking role at a youth forum in favor of Herbert Aptheker, known to his youthful audience as editor of Political Affairs.

(Political Affairs is the notorious "theoretical" magazine of the Communist Party.)

Rubin's barnstorming grand tour included appearances at William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.; Duke University, Durham, N.C.; and Union Theological Seminary, attached to the University of Virginia.

With the groundwork well laid in parts of the South and Midwest, the Communist functionary swung to the west coast. On October 28 he met with an assembly of students at Reed College, Portland, Oreg., and on November 1 at the University of Washington, Seattle, the youth leader unveiled a new come-on.

SUPERB SALESMAN

He distributed copies of New Horizons for Youth, a monthly Marxist publication edited by Mortimer Daniel Rubin.

On the following day the editor addressed a youth rally at Seattle's Wilsonian Hotel.

Throughout his tour of campuses, Rubin urged students to participate in the national organizing conference of progressive youth to be held in Chicago starting December 30.

Rubin proved to be a superb salesman. No less than 86 delegates appeared at the 3-day meeting held in Chicago's Albany Park Cultural Center.

AVERAGE AGE 22

Their average age was 22 and they registered from these States: California, 3; Washington, 4; Pennsylvania, 21; Ohio, 5; New York, 19; Minnesota, 2; Illinois, 29, and 1 each from Oregon, Michigan, and Iowa.

Rubin and two other group leaders conducted a preconference press interview to deny all Communist Party connections with the meeting. At his side were Alva Buxenbaum, 24, teacher in a Philadelphia suburb, and Milton Anthopoulos, who identified himself as being from the College of the City of New York.

While conference sessions were barred to the press, here's what transpired:

Miss Buxenbaum lauded the technical advances and increasing strength of the U.S.S.R. and her satellites, and said this constitutes a challenge to the United States. With youth demanding a brighter future, there is need for a new youth organization to uproot racial inequality, to fight for better schools and erase witch hunting.

HITS HOUSE COMMITTEE

The new group would exploit the evaluation of scientific socialism, which, of course, is communism.

Another speaker launched a bitter attack on the House Un-American Activities Committee and the FBI. Pearl Hart, president of the Chicago chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild, received a standing ovation after her talk.

(The National Lawyers' Guild has been cited as a Communist front, "the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party.")

Conference leaders beat down a delegate's suggestion that the new youth group should employ the word "socialism." They described as more acceptable a "broad leftwing student, teenage and working youth organization."

On February 17, 1961, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which, as I said, pointed up the need to inform fully our university students about communism and Communist tactics. It was by L. Jack Allen, Nebraska, chairman, Young Americans for Freedom, and discussed the danger of communism with special references to Nebraska University.

Anyone who reads these and other articles will only ask one question. That question is: "Why is Congress not doing more?"

The Washington Post and some other newspapers say the student riots at the San Francisco committee hearings last May were not Communist inspired.

As long as such publications close their eyes to what is going on the public interest requires that Congress investigate and inform the American people about communism and Communist tactics. University students and the public must obtain the facts.

Mr. Walter and the other members of the Committee on Un-American Activities have given patriotic and dedicated service. I cannot praise them too highly. Public apathy, not opposition to the Un-American Activities Committee is the only weapon the Communists can use which could be fatal.

Would that the committee had available twice as much money and a much larger staff. I would favor increased funds also to print more reports as to the menace of communism.

The answer to Communist propaganda and tactics in our country is an informed public and laws to punish traitors within the framework of the Constitution.

In conclusion, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge an adequate appropriation for the expenses of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Future of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the speech

delivered by HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS, Republican, of New York, on February 2, 1961, before the District of Columbia Republican Central Committee:

THE FUTURE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

As a member of the House District Committee in Congress, I am very properly concerned about the future of the Nation's Capital. Too few of our citizens across this great country really appreciate the difficulties we Members of Congress have in dealing with the affairs of what has now become the capital of the free world. How many people know that the District of Columbia was established solely for the purpose of becoming the permanent seat of Government of the United States? (So declared in the act of July 16, 1790.) How many Americans understand why the Federal Constitution provides that the Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the District of Columbia? While the Continental Congress was meeting in Philadelphia on June 20, 1783, veterans of the Revolutionary War arrived to obtain a settlement of accounts. The harassment by the soldiers continued for several days until Congress, abandoning hope that State authorities would disperse the soldiers, removed itself from Philadelphia. It met thereafter in Princeton and Trenton, N.J., Annapolis, Md., and New York City. The Continental Congress did not lightly dismiss this Philadelphia incident, and later that year adopted a resolution providing for buildings and land to be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. When our present Constitution was being debated in the Constitutional Convention of 1787, it was urged that provision be made for a permanent seat of Government under exclusive Federal control, away from any State capital so as to avoid similar incidents, and because the intermixture of the State and Federal Legislatures would tend to give a provincial tincture to the national deliberations. And that is how the District of Columbia achieved its unique status in our Federal Constitution.

As you know, the original District of Columbia passed under Federal control in 1800, consisting of an area 10 miles square, the portion north of the Potomac River having been ceded by Maryland, and that south of the Potomac River having been ceded by Virginia. In 1846 Congress retroceded to Virginia that portion of the District of Columbia in that State, during the administration of President Polk. The present District contains approximately 68 square miles (43,677 acres), of which 4,404 acres are water and 39,283 are land. Streets and alleys, etc., comprise 8,711 acres. The land area exclusive of streets (30,562 acres) is divided as follows: Taxable, 14,380 acres, or 47.1 percent; United States and District Governments, 14,256 acres, or 46.6 percent; other exempt (privately owned or foreign government), 1,926 acres, or 6.3 percent.

Up until the Civil War the population of the Nation's Capital was so small it didn't seem to make any difference what kind of community it was. There were few municipal improvements and the seat of Government had the appearance of a frontier town and was an international joke.

The population growth during and after the Civil War made Congress conscious that the District of Columbia no longer was a village, and in 1871 the independent municipal corporations of Georgetown and Washington City were abolished and a territorial government for the District was established. A successful effort was made literally to lift Washington out of the mud. Since that time, our Nation's Capital has developed, not only as the seat of Government, but as a center of culture with a great symphony

orchestra and other performing arts and several universities of international renown. It has become a symbol of hope and inspiration to all who love freedom around the world.

However, it would be less than candid for a Member of Congress charged with responsibility as a member of the House District Committee, to fail to recognize that behind the facade of beautiful tree-shaded boulevards, majestic Government buildings, beautiful residences, and spacious park areas filled with monuments of our Nation's heroes, there is another Washington whose future is uncertain.

This situation is not unique; for Washington is plagued by the same problems that are afflicting most of our large cities. My own home, the city of Rochester, has been wrestling with these serious developments for some time. There is the alarming flight to the suburbs of taxpaying families, causing a population drop from 803,000 in 1950 to 764,000 in 1960. There is an alarming budget increase from about \$140 million to \$286 million in the same period. Taxes on the local residents have been multiplied and multiplied again, until they are higher than the taxes of all but a handful of comparable cities in the United States. Crimes of violence and juvenile delinquency have increased from 25 percent to 30 percent since 1958 alone, despite one of the most comprehensive law-enforcement programs in the United States. There is a consistent increase in the welfare and health demands upon the District Government, with the number of persons receiving public assistance increasing at the rate of about 20 percent per year. The traffic problem—so vividly illustrated by the infamous storm of 2 weeks ago—and the problem of urban renewal seem to become more aggravated each month; and there is a serious question whether the District of Columbia is not losing the battle against the forces of decay.

In addition to all these problems, there are two major shifts in population underway. The first is in the age grouping of the population. There are relatively more persons in the District of Columbia in the very young and the very old groups, and comparatively fewer persons in the 18- to 44-year age group. Thus, there is a decrease among the taxpaying age group, but an increase in those groups that are heavy users of tax dollars through schools, health, welfare, and related services.

The second major population shift is racial. Each year the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia reports a change in the percentage ratio of white to non-white residents, with the white population having decreased now to about 45 percent. Moreover, the whites increasingly represent primarily the older population segment, and the nonwhite the younger. The implications of these trends are clear. The Nation's Capital will require more schools and welfare services, while at the same time the decline in the 18- to 44-year-old wage-earning, taxpaying group means less and less revenue potential. Revenue needs are increasing while the tax base grows smaller. All responsible citizens, regardless of race or creed, must feel a grave concern about the future of the District of Columbia in the light of these facts.

Members of Congress charged by the Federal Constitution with exclusive legislative responsibility for the Nation's Capital, must take more resolute steps to protect the interest of all of the people in their Nation's Capital City. We must not impose property, income and other taxes on local residents above the level of Maryland and Virginia, or we simply aggravate the flight of taxpayers to the suburbs. Sufficient Federal funds should be appropriated each year to carry forward public works, school construction, urban renewal, and maintenance

of the city so that it continues to be an attractive and desirable place to live for all Americans, regardless of race or creed. Furthermore, with regard to the population trends I mentioned earlier, the changing racial character of the District population, with all of its resultant economic and social challenges, must be squarely faced. And efforts must be made to encourage the educated, productive, working-age population to remain in the District. There has been too long a delay and indifference with respect to these matters, and Congress should discharge its constitutional responsibility to the Nation before it is too late.

The future of the District of Columbia ought to hold in prospect what a joint committee of Congress in 1915 once termed "the splendid and beautiful central residence of this great Nation, to become and be forever maintained as a model for all the cities of the world." This vision cannot be fulfilled unless the present trends are brought to a sharp and permanent halt and charted in a new and more favorable course.

Responsibility in Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, when it was announced that our colleague from New York, Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, was to be the principal speaker at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Republican County Committee of Union County, N.J., the affair quickly became a sellout.

The presence of some 500 Republican men and women in Watchung, N.J., on February 13, was testimony of the high regard in which our vigorous and able young colleague is held by those who have watched his brief but impressive career in the Congress.

JOHN LINDSAY's remarks on this occasion were, I am delighted to report, equal to his reputation. In a most interesting and original way, he developed the most important theme concerning the Republican Party today, "Effectiveness in Power; Responsibility in Opposition." He did this through a series of incisive word pictures of some of the men who have helped most to shape the Republican tradition and who themselves, under difficult circumstances, demonstrated the degree to which the national interest relies on a responsible and constructive opposition.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. LINDSAY's Union County speech, and I urge our colleagues to give it the attention it deserves. The speech follows:

A REPUBLICAN TRADITION: EFFECTIVENESS IN POWER; RESPONSIBILITY IN OPPOSITION

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, Senator CASE and Congressman FLORENCE DWYER, and your honored guest, former Secretary of Labor MITCHELL, it is flattering and reassuring to have been asked to be with you here tonight—because New Yorkers are not necessarily prophets with honor outside of their homes; or always even welcomed in the great stretches west of the Empire State.

When FLORENCE DWYER invited me to be with you tonight, it was an invitation that I accepted without hesitation, for my admiration and respect for FLORENCE as a legislator and a public officer is limitless. Her district has been receiving and will continue to receive intelligent and brave representation. And of course CLIFFORD CASE is a Republican whom I regard as being among the first in the Grand Old Party. He leads in our party and suggests new and constructive directions for its growth and welfare. I only wish that our party more often had the wisdom to learn and apply the lessons that he teaches.

Certainly New Jersey has distinguished itself in the quality and effectiveness of the leadership that it has contributed in the last 8 years both to the Eisenhower administration and to the Congress. Former Secretary of Labor JAMES MITCHELL is one of your native sons with whom I had the pleasure of sharing executive branch responsibilities for a period—I in a very small way in the Department of Justice, he in a very large way in the Cabinet. And Douglas DILLON is a man who commands the respect and admiration of the country, and of two administrations in office.

I want to talk tonight about some of the men who have made the Republican Party a great party, and who have given it inspiration and guidance, and chiefly about men who nobly and effectively filled the role of the opposition. The men that I will talk about tonight represent a pattern of fidelity to our historic institutions, coupled with insight and sensitivity to the problems of the future, that wove the strongest and most durable strands in the evolution of the Republican Party. The Republican tradition that I invoke is that which links the past to the future with indissoluble bonds without ever forgetting the requirements of either. We might call this the tradition of realism with vision.

I hasten to add at this point that I always hesitate to get into definitions about Republicans. I am reminded of the story about the famous geneticist who was asked for a definition of heredity. He thought for a moment and said, "Well, if your parents didn't have any children, the probability is that you won't, either." Nevertheless, happily risking the grunting reproach of those who say they can't abide hyphenated Republicans, let me say that men and women like CLIFFORD CASE and FLORENCE DWYER can be classified as prudent progressives, or, if you will, as enlightened conservatives, and that in them lies the strength of our party. They stand in the tradition of some of the great men of the Republican Party whose credo can be summed up as follows: wisdom and effectiveness in power; responsibility in opposition. Men cast in this mold, whether in power or in opposition, have always been distinguished by fidelity to our heritage, a vibrant awareness of public needs and public interests, and a strong sense of the movement of history. Such men, when entrusted with office, have exercised power with wisdom and effectiveness, while in opposition they have fulfilled their twofold obligation of constructive criticism and responsibility to the Nation.

History has a way of putting things in perspective. Thus when we meet to do honor to the memory of the first and the greatest Republican of them all, we do so in the assurance that our tributes are stamped with unchallengeable validity by the stern judgments of history. On February 12, 1923, a Congressman from Kansas, HOMER KOCH, addressed the House of Representatives with these words on Lincoln:

"There is no new thing to be said about Lincoln. There is no new thing to be said of the mountains, or of the sea, or of the stars. The years go their way, but the same old mountains lift their granite shoulders

above the drifting clouds; the same mysterious sea beats upon the shore; the same silent stars keep holy vigil above a tired world. But to the mountains and sea and stars men turn forever in unwearied homage. And thus with Lincoln. For he was a mountain in grandeur of soul, he was a sea in deep undervoice of mystic loneliness, he was a star in steadfast purity of purpose and service. And he abides."

Encomiums such as this, let us remember, were not tributes that Lincoln heard in his lifetime. Lincoln had to run uphill—he was forever standing up against a barrage of kicks, not a few of them delivered by members of his own party. You will recall that when he came up for a second term in office after 3 years of the "grinding drama of drums, blood, and agony," to borrow from Sandburg, there was hardly a Member of Congress who dared speak out to advocate a second term for the President. Sandburg points out that in early 1864 only one Congressman in the House of Representatives was definitely committed. He was Isaac Arnold of Illinois—49 years old, once a country schoolteacher in my own State of New York. "The opposition to Mr. Lincoln," wrote Indiana Republican Congressman George W. Julian, "was secretly cherished by many of the ablest and most patriotic men of the day. * * * Of the more earnest and thoroughgoing Republicans in both Houses of Congress probably not 1 in 10 really favored it (his renomination)." A committee of prominent Senators and Representatives issued a confidential circular bitterly attacking Lincoln and urging the nomination of Chase. Naturally the press printed the secret document in full. "Go on, gentlemen. Wash your dirty linen in public," jibed the Democratic New York World.

Lincoln was renominated and went on to fight a fierce and blistering campaign. On election night the reelected President spoke from the White House by torchlight: "It has long been a grave question," Lincoln said, "whether any government, not too strong for the liberties of its people, can be strong enough to maintain its own existence, in great emergencies." And he went on: "So long as I have been here I have not willingly planted a thorn in any man's bosom." As Sandburg has pointed out in his book, the outlook that Lincoln was here voicing was "toward conciliation—no retaliation, no reprisals, no thorns knowingly planted in the bosoms of others."

This is what I mean by wisdom and effectiveness in power.

Let us now look at some of the other men whom history has elevated to heights they never knew in their lifetimes, and some whom even history has overlooked.

William Howard Taft, he deserved greater tribute than he received in his lifetime, and in my judgment, he merits a kinder verdict than history has accorded him. He was bitterly attacked during his tenure of office because of his rigorously constitutional view of the powers of the Presidency—a view that advocates of strong leadership have always hastened to decry, but one which, by any fair standard of judgment, must be respected as an important strand in our national development.

But the reason I call up Taft's name is not so much what he did in office, but after. He became the unofficial leader of the movement for a league of nations. As the leading figure in an organization of distinguished citizens known as the League to Enforce Peace, he worked tirelessly for a world body with enforcement powers. He gave wise counsel and faithful support to President Wilson—a distinguished effort that was little appreciated either by Wilson or by the public as a whole. He received no reward, except the personal satisfaction that he was responsible in opposition.

Taft was never quite partisan enough to please his Republican colleagues. Speaker of the House Joe Cannon said of him, "The trouble with Taft is that if he were Pope he would find it necessary to appoint a few Protestant cardinals." Taft himself said:

"Political considerations have never weighed heavily with me. I have tried to do in each case what seemed to me the wisest thing, regardless of its effect upon my own future. Indeed, in more than one case I have been perfectly conscious bad blood would be stirred by some act of mine or some refusal to act. The circumstance that the same persons who hail me, after one application of equal justice, as a far-seeing, conservative patriot, denounce me after the next as an unreasoning radical, does not greatly disturb my equanimity. I set that down as all in a day's work."

I am sure that this comment of Taft's will strike a sympathetic chord with many of you who are here tonight. Every man and woman in elective office has felt the shifting barbs of public reproach from those who think of liberal versus conservative attitudes as so many pigeonholes, each carefully labeled—black or white, God or Devil.

There is a wonderful passage from Stephen Vincent Benet's "John Brown's Body" in which Lincoln soliloquizes:

"Bull Run—the 7 days—Bull Run again—and 18 months of war—and still no end to it."

"WHAT IS GOD'S WILL?"

"They come to me and talk about God's will in righteous deputations and platoons, Day after day, laymen and ministers. They write me prayers from 20 million souls defining me God's will and Horace Greeley's, God's will is General this and Senator that, God's will is those poor colored fellows' will, It is the will of the Chicago churches, It is this man's and his worst enemy's. But all of them are sure they know God's will."

I am the only man who does not know it."

Responsibility in opposition was the credo of a latter day Taft, whose work is more familiar to you. Robert A. Taft was in the mainstream of the great Republican tradition I have been discussing.

Now let me talk for a moment about another but lesser known figure in the Republican tradition of effectiveness in power and responsibility in opposition—Henry L. Stimson. Stimson is best described as a progressive conservative—the term which he applied to himself. As Secretary of State in the Hoover administration, he gave unwavering support to the beleaguered President in domestic affairs while in foreign affairs he struck the first small breach in the wall of an isolationism that during the interwar years gripped both parties and virtually all of the American people.

Stimson's credo as a progressive conservative was built on two basic convictions: First, that the primary and overriding requirement of all government was that it should not infringe the essential liberties of the individual, and second, that within this limitation government could and must be made a powerful instrument of positive action.

It seemed absurd to Stimson that a profound respect for human freedom should be construed into an assertion that all government was evil. Stimson's political philosophy was in its essence a belief in the possibility of combining democracy with leadership. The democrats of the 19th century had feared government as the tool of despotism and had deliberately made it weak. Stimson and those of like mind feared weak government as an open invitation to private despotism, and they sought to restore its strength. To make the government weak because all government seemed dangerous

was in Stimson's view a plain abdication of responsibility and an open confession that democracy and effective government could not be combined.

When the Japanese made the first major assault on the peace system of 1919 by their aggression in Manchuria in 1931, the League of Nations looked for the United States to take the lead in an area of traditional American responsibility. In the face of an overwhelmingly isolationist public opinion, the Secretary of State enunciated the "Stimson Doctrine": the United States would not recognize the fruits of aggression. A moral embargo was imposed against Japan by the United States, and the League adopted the same posture. The Stimson doctrine, of course, did not thwart the Japanese aggression, but it expressed the conscience of the United States at a time when that conscience seemed to be frozen solid under the glacier of isolationism. Stimson went as far as he could go—that he could go only a pitifully short distance was a factor of his times and not of his desires and convictions. In the days of deep isolationism, Stimson, virtually alone, exemplified realism with vision.

Stimson fought hard for President Hoover's reelection in 1932. He believed in Hoover and he disapproved of Franklin Roosevelt's policies as they were set forth in the campaign. Stimson accepted the defeat gracefully and eased the transition for his successor. He then withdrew to retirement.

On June 19, 1940, Stimson, at work in his New York law office, received a telephone call from the White House. The President whom he had opposed now called on him to serve as Secretary of War. Roosevelt confessed that the war emergency in Washington was running at loose ends and that Stimson's steady hand was needed. Stimson laid down conditions, which were accepted, and with another distinguished Republican, Frank Knox, accepted the call to serve in what was soon to become Roosevelt's national war Cabinet. Stimson was widely attacked by Republicans for his decision to accept a major post in the Democratic administration. The Republican Convention was coming up and it was generally considered that the President had stolen a political march and that Mr. Stimson had made it possible for him to do so. Interestingly enough, the partisan outcry backfired, because the country approved of Stimson's decision. Stimson was in any case unmoved by the hue and cry. In a time of national and world crisis, he set partisanship aside without hesitation and turned over to the Nation's service all of his formidable capacities of wisdom and statesmanship. In due course, he was given recognition for what he was—a man of enormous integrity who was eminently responsible in opposition.

Throughout the war, Stimson ran the War Department with energy, dedication, and decisiveness, culminating his career with the awesome task of guiding a new and unprepared President in the climatic final days of the war. It was Stimson who briefed President Truman on the existence of the Manhattan project which was soon to produce the world's first atomic bomb, and it was Stimson who served as the President's most intimate adviser in the agonizing process which led to the decision to use the new weapon against Japan.

Stimson's role in the decision to use the atomic bomb was the ultimate manifestation of his qualities as a statesman guided by realism with vision. This is what he wrote about this epochal event:

"The decision to use the atomic bomb was a decision that brought death to over a 100,000 Japanese. No explanation can change that fact and I do not wish to gloss it over. But this deliberate, premeditated destruction was our least abhorrent choice.

The destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki put an end to the Japanese war."

Stimson looked far beyond the immediate act, perceiving the horrendous implications for the future. He continued with these words:

"In this last great action of the Second World War we were given final proof that war is death. War in the 20th century has grown steadily more barbarous, more destructive, more debased in all its aspects. Now, with the release of atomic energy, man's ability to destroy himself is very nearly complete. The bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki ended a war. They also made it wholly clear that we must never have another war. This is the lesson men and leaders everywhere must learn, and I believe that when they learn it they will find a way to lasting peace. There is no other choice."

Next let me talk about another great Republican, cut from the same mold—Wendell Willkie. Here was a man who rose far above personal ambition to espouse a responsible opposition that in the final countdown became the price of political victory. His concern with America's future and the cause of freedom, at great personal sacrifice, astonished his most vociferous adversaries. In the campaign of 1940, the *New York Times* declared: "Even such professional cynics as newsmen knew that no mere love of office or appetite for acclaim could drive a man to the punishment Willkie was taking daily."

Taking up the work begun by Stimson, Willkie was one of the first Americans of either party to see that America, whether it wished to or not, was bound to live in an interdependent world—"one world," as he called it—and that America's survival was indissolubly linked to the survival of all free peoples. He saw the close relationship between foreign and domestic policy, and he laid foundations upon which such men as Arthur Vandenberg could build even more, moving toward the now commonly accepted idea of bipartisanship in foreign policy. Willkie persuaded others of the importance of international responsibility and he recharged the Republican Party with vibrant progressivism, internal and domestic, that had sagged to levels which never were intended for the party of Lincoln. "A political party," declared Willkie, "can never stand still. . . . Those leaders of a party who insist on applying old formulas to present problems merely because those formulas worked in the past are damaging the party and will eventually destroy it. For these are standing still, whereas the world around them moves."

Willkie was to some extent a visionary. He wanted to exchange a small measure of sovereignty for the surpassing goal of achieving man's age-old aspiration toward "one world"—an established system of world peace under world law. War to Willkie was intolerable, but peace without justice was worse.

Willkie's conduct of the 1940 presidential campaign was nothing less than a towering demonstration of responsible opposition. Although it might conceivably have won the election for him, Willkie refused to make a campaign issue out of the destroyer deal with Great Britain, even though there was serious question as to the constitutionality of the arrangement by which 50 World War I destroyers were transferred to war-torn Britain by an executive agreement that bypassed the treaty powers of the Senate. Britain was undergoing the awful trials of her "finest hour" and invasion by the victorious German armies seemed imminent. If Britain were defeated and her fleet fell into German hands, America would stand alone and exposed, an isolated fortress in a hostile world.

Undoubtedly burdened and torn by the politics of the question in his own mind, Willkie perceived that his country was confronted, not with a theory but with a condition of cataclysmic potentialities. In the interests of the free world, Willkie set aside an explosive partisan issue, and perhaps it cost him the election, but it may also have saved the world from the advent of a new Dark Age. Here was responsibility of heroic proportions. I like to think that in the long run this was also the best politics.

One cannot discuss Willkie's role in international affairs without logically moving to another Republican in this great tradition—Senator Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan. Throughout the 1930's Vandenberg was as stout an opponent of the New Deal as could be found. He was also an aggressive isolationist. During the war he underwent something resembling an agonizing reappraisal, and a man of his integrity had no inclination to conceal the total reversal of his convictions behind a cloud of platitudes and sophistries. Vandenberg became as articulate and effective an internationalist as has appeared in the last generation.

An eminent place in our history is assured to Vandenberg by reason of his role as the preeminent statesman in the forging of a bipartisan foreign policy for the postwar era. The Marshall plan probably would have been impossible without his powerful advocacy in a Republican Congress of this blueprint of a Democratic administration for saving free Europe.

As a delegate to the San Francisco conference, Vandenberg successfully resisted Soviet efforts to emasculate the United Nations Charter and was largely responsible for some of the most constructive and foresighted provisions of the Charter. He successfully fought down the Soviet effort to hobble the General Assembly with restrictions on the scope of its deliberations, and largely at Vandenberg's tenacious insistence the Soviets yielded on their demand for an absolute veto in the Security Council, one that would encompass even procedural questions and recommendations for the peaceful settlement of disputes. In his diary, Vandenberg wrote these words of the total veto, which our own State Department had accepted as authorized by the Yalta agreements:

"It means, in plain language, that the Russians can raise hell all over the world, through satellites and fifth columns, and stop the new league from even inquiring into it. It is the worst of our legacies from Roosevelt."

Largely because of Vandenberg's efforts this legacy was overcome. The substantive veto, of course, remained, and Vandenberg was in favor of it, but the added veto that would have all but denuded the U.N. of its basic freedom of inquiry was most fortunately prevented.

Vandenberg was also largely responsible for article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which is the legal basis of NATO, indeed of our entire collective security system. Here was extraordinary foresight, for it was the famous Vandenberg resolution of 1948 which gave President Truman the mandate of the Republican-controlled Senate for the negotiation of the North Atlantic Treaty. The Vandenberg resolution gave the sanction of the Senate to American participation in military and political alliances for the defense of the free world. It is thus a major state paper in our diplomatic history, the ultimate reversal of the dictum of Washington's Farewell Address, which, though admirably conceived for the problems of the 18th century, was bound to give way to a dynamic new doctrine for the 20th century. It was Vandenberg who provided this doctrine.

Vandenberg, as loyal a Republican as one can find in our history, must have known that Harry Truman would claim partisan

credit for accomplishments which he, Vandenberg, had made possible. It was perhaps an unpleasant price to pay for the rewards of responsible opposition, but Vandenberg paid it gladly, knowing that the stakes of history far exceeded personal vanities and partisan predilections.

This brings us down to Eisenhower, whose place in this noble tradition is beyond question. It fell to Eisenhower, whose renown was established as a statesman-general under Democratic Presidents, to heal the ugly schisms that had developed within our own body politic during the closing years of the long Democratic era. He gave a new and urgently needed unity to the Nation and always placed the preservation of the peace and defense of the free world above considerations of partisan advantage.

In the closing days of his administration, President Eisenhower pointed the way for the Republican Party as it goes into opposition. No effort was spared in his determination to insure continuity through the change of administrations and to protect the Nation from the dangers, foreign and domestic, of a stagnant interregnum. Setting aside the bitter criticisms that were leveled against his stewardship during the campaign, President Eisenhower presided over the transition with dignity and generosity, for these, as no one knows better than he, are dangerous days, when the dubious satisfactions of partisan recrimination must be subordinated to the overriding requirements of American unity in a perilous world.

In this talk I have not mentioned some other Republicans who were effective progressives, and who were immensely important Republican keynoters—Theodore Roosevelt, for example, who gave luster and vitality to the Republican tradition; Richard Nixon, who elevated the Vice Presidency to unprecedented heights. My purpose here has been rather to talk about men who, by the turn of history, found themselves in opposition, and who met that responsibility with courage and sacrifice in the interest of America.

Now with the loss of Executive power we Republicans are again confronted with the democratic responsibility of providing vigilant but constructive opposition. This responsibility lies chiefly with those of us in the Congress. It is a difficult and often thankless task, indeed far more difficult, I think, in many respects than being in the majority. But in exercising the responsibilities of democratic opposition, we can do no better than to apply the lessons taught by those eminent Republicans of whom I have spoken this evening.

Here then is the task that confronts us—to confront the Democratic administration with support where it is warranted, but with articulate and coherent opposition when that administration, in our judgment, presses unwise or ill-conceived policies or flaunts the public interest. I do not propose the initiation of a false "era of good feeling," for without opposition there is no democracy. Were we to offer this administration nothing but passive and amiable consent to all that it proposes, we would be derelict in our duties and we would be doing a grave disservice to ourselves and, above all, to the American people—for it is the function of the opposition to oppose. We must scrutinize all that the majority proposes and resist with all our resources when we think they are wrong. But we must also support them when they are right, and when the national interest is at stake, we—and they—must set aside our partisan interests and work for the good of the Nation.

Let us follow the example of those great Republicans whom I have invoked tonight. We have been wise and effective in power; let us now be responsible and constructive in opposition.